

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

MR. D. G. HOGARTH, M.A., F.S.A., has published the paper on the Hittites which he read at the Winnipeg Meeting of the British Association in 1909. He has published it in the thirty-ninth volume of the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*.

---

Mr. HOGARTH gives an account of recent Hittite research. He does not review in detail the early history of the Hittite problem. That problem was set before scholars in the latter part of the nineteenth century by the discovery that a West Asiatic people, called the Kheta or Khatti, played an important part in the foreign relations of Egypt and Assyria, together with the further discovery of a class of monuments in a peculiar art and script which were claimed to be the work of that people. It was generally agreed that the Kheta or Khatti were identical with the Hittites of the Old Testament.

---

The monuments were observed first in Northern Syria. Scholars were accordingly inclined to regard the Hittites and their civilization as primarily Syrian. And so long as this view held the field, they were considered of comparatively small account. But after similar monuments were found in Asia Minor, the estimate of Hittite importance began to grow; and some scholars, notably Professor SAYCE, spoke roundly of a

'Hittite Empire.' Presently RAMSAY, PERROT, and others agreed with SAYCE that the original home of Hittite culture was not in Syria but in Cappadocia.

---

This was the signal for a great battle, which was fought as only archaeologists' battles can be fought. But Mr. HOGARTH is able to say that the issue was practically decided four years ago, and in SAYCE's favour. For in 1906 the whole Hittite problem was set in a new light by the discovery that the rock-reliefs at Boghaz Koi in North-Western Cappadocia belonged to the Hittite civilization.

---

The site of Boghaz Koi (as Mr. HOGARTH spells the name) was discovered in 1834. It was discovered independently, and almost simultaneously, by TEXIER and HAMILTON. What attracted their attention most was a series of rock-reliefs on the walls of a hypæthral recess in a hillside, a short distance away. Thirty years later Napoleon III. sent an expedition to explore Galatia and Cappadocia, and these rock-reliefs were published. But it was not till 1878 that it was observed by SAYCE that the style of the reliefs was identical with what was already known as Hittite art. Then in 1890 CHANTRE did some digging at the spot. Others followed; and after several applications had been made to the Ottoman Government for leave to

excavate the place, a German application was successful, and Dr. Hugo WINCKLER proceeded to the site of the ancient city in 1906.

A startling revelation ensued. Many tablets were found. One of the fragments contained part of a document, whose tenor was identical with that of the famous treaty made by Rameses II. with Khetasar, King of the Hittites, about 1280 B.C., and inscribed on a wall at Karnak. The Kheta kings named on the wall at Karnak were named also on the Boghaz Koi tablet. The spelling was not exactly the same, but there was no doubt of the identity. Khetasar, who made the treaty, was Hattusil; his predecessor, Mutnara, was Mutallu; the next in ascent, Maurasar or Marsar, was Mursil; and finally Sapalulu or Sapararu, who had treated with Seti I., was written Subbiluliuma.

When other tablets were read, most of which were found in 1907, it was discovered not only that Boghaz Koi had taken part in the conspiracy of the Kheta against Rameses, and that it was a worshipper of the Hittite god Teshup, but that it was the head of the conspiracy and the chief city of Khetasar or Hattusil. It was now beyond question that the tablets belonged to royal archives, that they were the archives of the kings of Boghaz Koi from the fifteenth to the twelfth dynasty B.C., and that the Hatti or Hittites were really a great people, widespread and warlike, who formed an empire fit to cope with the mighty empires of Egypt or Babylon. Subbiluliuma writes to Katashman-Turgu, King of Babylon, not as a vassal, but as an equal, and urges him to take action against a common enemy, conjectured by WINCKLER to have been the rising North Semitic power of Assyria.

Hittite figures carved in the rock near Smyrna cease to be an inexplicable puzzle. SAYCE's contention that Lydia was once a Hittite satrapy passes from the region of much derided speculation into the domain of reasonable inference. The observations of RAMSAY, PERROT, and others, that

the earlier Phrygian monuments display strong Cappadocian characteristics, find their justification and their explanation. And Mr. H. R. HALL does not go too far in calling the Hatti the 'type-people of Asia Minor,' and in saying that those conceptions, usages, and the like, which we have long recognized in ancient life as 'Anatolian,' must in future be regarded as in origin Hittite.

There is a great deal that has yet to be discovered about the Hittites. What happened to the Hittites in Syria? How is it that the Amarna correspondence speaks of the Kheta as a danger only to the northern borders of Syria, while the 'children of Heth' are mentioned in the history of Abraham as dwelling at Hebron in the far south, and a fragmentary chronicle of the First Babylonian Dynasty states that the Hatti invaded Southern Mesopotamia about 1800 B.C.? These questions cannot be answered yet. WINCKLER thinks that the Cappadocian Hatti were not the only Hittites, but were part, if ultimately the most important part, of a race once widely distributed over Western Asia. And that, which is the easiest, may be the best way out of the difficulty. But there are other and perhaps greater difficulties than that. There is the difficulty, and supreme surprise, of the Boghaz Koi tablets, that the royal house of Mitani, in the time of Hatti domination, invoked gods who have familiar Aryan names, Indra, Mithra, Varuna, and the Aşvin Twins.

The Rev. George HANSON, D.D., delivered the Murtle Lecture in Aberdeen on the 30th of January 1910. And now, through the Religious Tract Society, he has published the lecture, under the title of *The Originality of the Gospel*.

The title is not well chosen. His subject is not the originality of the Gospel, but its uniqueness. When he went to Aberdeen to deliver the Murtle Lecture, Dr. HANSON determined to show that in certain particulars Christianity or the Gospel—for he uses the one word for the other—is separate

from, and superior to, every other form of religion in the world. He determined to show that Christianity is 'unapproachably pre-eminent' in three particulars.

---

Christianity is pre-eminent in respect of its doctrine of Atonement. That is the first thing. There is a doctrine of Atonement in other religions. There is scarcely a religion on the face of the earth that is without the doctrine or the practice of Atonement. But in every religion, except the Christian, Atonement means the self-sacrifice of man for God's sake. In the Christian religion it means the self-sacrifice of God for man's sake.

---

The doctrine of Atonement, outside Christianity, may be summed up, says Dr. HANSON, in the words, 'Man so feared God that he offered his best and dearest to Him; if thereby he might turn away His anger.' The Christian doctrine of Atonement is 'God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son.' These two doctrines are in opposition fundamentally. In the one, man seeks by pain and anguish, often unto death, to reconcile God to him. In the other, God seeks by pain and anguish unto blood to reconcile man to Him. The one idea arises out of man's dread of God, the other out of God's love to man. And these two ideas, though both are gathered under the title of the doctrine of Atonement, are wide as the Poles apart. The idea of God taking upon Himself the burden of the sin of the world, and expiating its guilt at infinite cost to Himself, 'is absolutely undreamt of outside the New Testament.' That is the first thing.

---

But Christianity is also unique in respect of the conditions of salvation. What are the conditions of salvation? Everywhere but in Christianity salvation is by human merit. In Christianity it is by the grace of God.

---

In all non-Christian religions, says Dr. HANSON, man earns the divine favour by his own virtues. If he attains to salvation he has himself to thank

for it. It is the result of his own exertion. It is his own achievement. And there is no Gospel in good works. But the Christian religion is a Gospel. The Gospel is that the salvation of man is the gift of God. And so free is the gift that no merit in any man can improve it. So free is it that no sin in any man can depreciate it. The Gospel is that the chief of sinners is offered at once, without effort or delay, the place of the chief of saints. That is the second thing.

---

The third respect in which Christianity is unique is in its doctrine of the Person of Christ. What is that doctrine? It is that *God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself*. And that being so, Christ cannot be separated from the Christian religion. Its uniqueness lies in that. It lies in that more than in anything else. For you can separate Muhammad from Muhammadanism, Buddha from Buddhism, Confucius from Confucianism, and these religions will remain religions still. But you cannot separate Christ from Christianity. Christianity is Christ. The messenger here is also the message. The preacher is the sermon. Christ Himself is our peace. He is the way. He does not merely speak to us of immortality. He is the Resurrection and the Life.

---

'Not long ago,' says Mr. Claude MONTEFIORE, 'I received a letter from one of the greatest Jewish scholars of Germany, in which he differentiates, to the disadvantage of Jesus, between him and the prophets, on this ground that the prophets are so grandly impersonal; they think and speak of God and Israel, and never of themselves.' For this is the distinction between Christianity and Judaism, as between Christianity and every other prophetic religion in the world. And Mr. MONTEFIORE, Jew as he still is, has discovered this superiority. The quotation which we have made is from his new book on *The Teaching of Jesus* (Macmillan; 2s. 6d. net). The life and the teaching of Jesus, he bravely says, are inseparable. And in spite of the letter of the German scholar, 'Herein,' he declares, 'we may at once observe that Jesus

differs from, or, as some would say, goes beyond, the prophets: "More than a prophet is here."

---

The central place now given to the Gospel according to St. Mark in the study of the Synoptics is one of the results of the Higher Criticism which one can point to with unmixed pleasure. It is so sure. It is so welcome. We read St. Mark now as he has not been read in all the history of the Church.

---

And as we read St. Mark, we are ever more impressed with his naturalness. More than the others, he sees what there is to be seen, and writes that down. When he describes the Feeding of the Five Thousand, he says that our Lord 'commanded them that all should sit down by companies upon the green grass.' St. Matthew omits the 'companies'; and both he and St. Luke disregard the greenness of the grass. When he tells the story of the Rich Young Ruler, he alone notices that Jesus 'was going forth into the way,' and that the ruler 'ran to him and kneeled.'

---

The local colouring gives the scene reality. But it is not the art of the painter; it is the work of the historian. We do not ask, Why did St. Mark say that the ruler ran? We ask, Why did the ruler run?

---

Why did the ruler run? Dr. Alexander MACKENNAL, a wise, far-seeing student of the Gospels, suggests that Jesus was already on His way before the ruler could overcome his reluctance to seek His spiritual direction. That is very likely. For it meant more than an effort to overcome a natural shyness. It meant a victory over the deep-seated, far-reaching prejudice of his class. The ruler was probably present all the time. All the time, it is probable, an agitating struggle was going on within him. And it is at least possible that what turned the scale at last was the incident of the blessing of the little children.

We may take it that that incident, which immediately precedes in all the narratives, immediately preceded in the course of events. What was it? Certain persons—we are not told that they were 'mothers of Salem,' but we are ready to believe it—brought little children to Him that He should touch them. The idea was very likely a superstitious one. The touch, the mere physical contact with a wonder-worker, has always been held to be good. Try it: you would wonder what good it might do. But the disciples were more enlightened than that. They rebuked those that brought them. And the ruler was looking on.

---

To his great surprise Jesus disapproved of the disciples' action. He was even moved with indignation. And yet there is no doubt that the disciples were right. If one's actions are to be regulated by rules, if reason is to be the guide of conduct, it is certain that the disciples were right. What astonished the ruler was the fact that Jesus superseded reason, that He set the rules of conduct aside. And His indignation with the disciples was evidence enough that no passing sentimentality moved Him, but a far-reaching motive of life.

---

As the ruler was considering this, Jesus left the house, passed into the road, and began His journey. The moment had come for decision. Gladly would he have taken time to think. What might this new attitude to law and conduct involve? But at least Jesus was larger-minded than ordinary men. He ran to Him, and kneeled to Him, and asked Him, 'Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?'

---

Jesus sent him back to the commandments. A moment before, the commandments were set aside; now they are brought prominently forward. 'Thou knowest the commandments, Do not kill, Do not commit adultery.' It must have been a disappointment, as well as a shock. Is He simply an original then? Does His behaviour mean no more than that it must always be different from the behaviour of other people? When you expect

Him to say, Keep the commandments, does He set them aside? When you come to set them aside, or at least to go beyond them, does He say, Keep the commandments? 'All these have I observed from my youth: *what lack I yet?*'

Jesus was not inconsistent. That is not the way in which He was original. He led the disciples to see that life is greater than the laws that try to measure it. He will lead the ruler to see the very same thing, though in another way. 'All these have I observed.' And He does not doubt it. Then 'Jesus, looking upon him, loved him.' But it is not enough to observe all these. If eternal life is to be gained by observing the commandments, it is necessary to observe more than these. It is necessary to have a rule for every act of life, for every utterance, and for every thought.

Jesus did not say so to the ruler. For that the ruler knew already. In the history of the commandments the Jews had discovered that. And they had tried to meet the difficulty. Is there a heroic effort after righteousness to be compared with the effort these Jewish rabbis made to find a law that would fit every circumstance of life, and insist that every law under every circumstance should be observed? The ruler knew that if he was to obtain eternal life, which is the fulness of righteousness in the sight of God, he must observe not only the weightier matters, but also tithe mint and anise and cummin; he knew that he must not omit one jot or tittle of all the rabbinic refinements which the ages of baffled experience had gathered round the original law.

The man was there at Jesus' feet simply because he knew that, and knew that he had not done it. If he had been able to keep all the commandments, he would have felt no heart-hunger driving him to seek Jesus. 'All these have I observed'; but he was compelled to add, 'What lack I yet?'

And Jesus led him as He led the disciples. It is not in the letter. It is in the spirit. To keep all and yet offend in one—it is at least to lack. It is to find Jesus necessary. But when the commandments are known, not in the letter, but in the spirit, there is nothing lacking.

And how easily could this young ruler be led to know the commandments in the spirit. Is it not expressed in the Scriptures of the Old Testament? Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God, and thy neighbour as thyself. On this hangs all the law. Let the rich young ruler, like the disciples, drop all the minutiae of regulations and fall back on love, love to God and man, and he has in that moment inherited eternal life.

As to how that is to be accomplished, as to how a man is to learn to love—that depends on the man. For this ruler the way is evident. 'Sell that thou hast and give to the poor.' Between him and the love of God stood the love of 'that he had.' If he can put it out of the way, he will be free to love God with all his heart. And if, in putting it out of the way, he can give it to the poor, he will also be showing that he loves his neighbour.

With the rich young ruler the way was clear. He had to learn to love. But how will it be with those who have already learned to love, but not to love God? Will the love of lover do, the love of husband or wife, the love of children? It will do very well if it is an unselfish love. In all unselfishness he that is not against God is for Him. But if it is a selfish love it will not do. And then sometimes there is no way but the removal of the object of it.

Eyes that the preacher's art in vain hath schooled,  
By wayside graves are raised;  
And lips cry, God be merciful,  
That ne'er said, God be praised.

## Christologies Ancient and Modern.

BY THE REV. H. R. MACKINTOSH, D. PHIL., D. D., PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY  
IN THE NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

THE late Professor A. B. Davidson is credited with the remark, *à propos* of Dr. Sanday's well-known article 'Jesus Christ,' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, that 'the thing could not be better done.' Since that time we have all been pleasurably aware that Dr. Sanday was invited, and has agreed, to undertake the Life of Christ for the 'International Theological Library.' No one could have been found better qualified for the great task. His preparations have been made slowly; this is the third preliminary volume issued within the last five years, all of them being composed of lectures delivered originally to students of theology, and preserving even in book form much of the informal charm of direct speech. He tells us now that of these introductory studies this is, as he hopes, the last; in his own words, 'It is necessary that I should make clear, as much to myself as to others, the broad lines of the conception which I have formed of the most central portion of my subject—that portion round which everything else really revolves.' Hence in a survey of Christologies ancient and modern, followed by the sketch of an original hypothesis, he seeks to bring out leading principles, unhampered by details, and to state these principles in terms intelligible to the wide general public. In the preface Dr. Sanday affirms anew his belief in the fundamental decisions of the ancient Church, as having been arrived at under the providential influence of God: 'it is to me incredible,' he writes, 'that He should intend the course of modern development to issue in direct opposition to them.' To this general acquiescence the argument of the book is faithful, but it is an acquiescence, as we shall see, which is conceived as quite in harmony with frank criticism of the older phrases, and it goes along with a firm resolve not to 'play fast and loose with criticism.' Dr. Sanday holds that criticism and tradition really meet, though not perhaps within the range of our present instruments of vision. On neither side must there be anything like coercion.

My purpose now is first of all to give a brief

running commentary on Dr. Sanday's more important results in historical Christology, and thereafter to devote special attention to his 'new and unexplored' theory that we may find the key to our Lord's higher being in the modern psychological idea of the Subliminal Consciousness. It will be seen that this theory, if sound, will involve some considerable alteration in our thoughts of Christ, and that it cannot be accepted or declined without close scrutiny.

Good people are now and then perturbed by Dr. Sanday's almost clairvoyant appreciation of other points of view, and his plea in the first chapter for the naturalness even of Docetism is a notable instance of that sympathy which makes him one of the most alert and hospitable conservatives. 'Docetism was not all folly. Rather we may regard it as one primitive form of the assertion of that mystical element which has never been wanting to Christianity, from the first days until now' (p. 9). The gospel came from the Orient, and if it is now to be attractively reintroduced to the Oriental mind, and to satisfy its immemorial native forms of thought, its latent mysticism must be allowed for. Docetism and pantheism are both ethically impossible, but on the other hand a Christianity without mysticism is religiously impossible. A docetic view of Christ treats history as moonshine; yet Christ must be so conceived that we may dwell in Him, and He in us. And the Docetics were groping after this. The success of Ignatius' reply to them was owing to his faith in the indwelling Christ as the source of life for all believers.

At more than one point, in this first section, Dr. Sanday comes into friendly collision with men like Harnack and Loofs. They, I imagine, would disown his approving remark that 'the essential principle which underlies the doctrine of the Trinity finds its first expression in a Valentinian writer,' and in his brief estimate of the Apologists he crosses their path intentionally. If Loofs complains that the Apologists by their doctrine of the Logos tended to lower Christology instead of heightening it, Dr. Sanday's reply is that

'sooner or later, it was inevitable that Christianity should be brought into relation with the contemporary philosophy. And, if that was to be done at all, was there any grander idea, already coined and current, than that of the Logos, that could be used for the purpose? Was there any idea with anything like the same sweep and range?' It is well that this should be said, and for a final judgment we no doubt have to consider the further point also that 'the Apologists certainly did not conceive of the activity of the Logos as purely intellectual.' At the same time, Loofs appears to be so far right that St. John and the Apologists come to the Logos-idea from appreciably different points of view. To the one it is a useful philosophic symbol; the pre-existent One normally thought of as *Son* (this is clear, I think, if we take the Prologue and chap. 17<sup>1-5</sup> together), may for a special didactic purpose be designated as Logos; to the Apologists, on the other hand, the Logos is the influential and paramount idea, distinctively metaphysical, and with at best a neutral relation to concrete history. They interpret Jesus Christ by the Logos; St. John interprets the Logos by Jesus Christ. The chasm is not quite impassable, but for all that it is there.

In some fresh pages on Irenæus and Tertullian I may single out a few particularly well-timed words on the conception of an economic Trinity. No doubt for a real synthesis we are compelled to probe deeper, unless forbidden by a purely relativistic theory of knowledge; we cannot rest content with a Triune Life that is merely provisional or on the surface. But we do well, nevertheless, to note that 'it was right and proper, because it was natural, that the conception should begin in this form.' It not only began in this form historically; it must always begin thus, if it is not to be separated from its basis in history and experience. Nothing we discover afterwards as to the value of the Trinitarian idea for speculation can touch the fact that 'the first impulse to it was given by the belief in the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ; and then as a further step came the necessity to co-ordinate with this that world-wide movement which all Christians described as the work of the Holy Spirit' (p. 27). So that advocates of what are usually described as 'economic' and 'ontological' views of the Trinity may travel at least part of the way in each other's company.

But Dr. Sanday makes no apology for Trinitarian doctrine, nor need we. 'Why should there not be in that abyss which we call "God" some differentiation of being or function which does not amount to division?' As the background to what we know of Christ, of God in Christ, something of this kind is an essential postulate; and if it be said that the description of such distinctions within the Godhead is negative merely, not affirmative, the objection may be conceded, but with the query whether it is one which the Christian theologian has any right to put. Most Christian theologians lay it down that God is *causa sui*, yet when we look into our own minds is that phrase more than negative, however indispensable? It cannot be positively defined, yet we are obliged to grant its truth. There is point in the celebrated Moses Stuart of Andover's reply to Channing, 'When you will give me an affirmative description of underived existence, I may safely engage to furnish you with one of *person* in the Trinity.' Dr. Sanday will carry most of us with him in his severe allusions to Tritheistic forms of doctrine. Had there been less Tritheism, we might have wanted Unitarianism. Strictly we use the word 'person' merely because of the poverty of language; to designate our belief in a real distinction in God, that is, not to affirm independent conscious beings, possessing separate 'essences'; and 'we must never cease to be grateful to St. Augustine for that phrase—*non ut illud diceretur, sed ne taceretur*.'

It was the Christian instinct that vanquished Arianism; but has Dr. Sanday any real ground for saying that this instinct operated unconsciously? His exact words are: 'Such instinctive tendencies are really of no slight moment; they show the working of forces that do not take shape in tangible argument, but are none the less part of that constructive whole to which the unconscious processes of the human mind contribute as much or more than the conscious' (p. 43). The passage is worth noting as indicating a slight bias, more definite in other places, towards what I may perhaps call the glorification of the 'unconscious.' Some of these passages will come up later. Here it is only necessary to urge that naïve and unreflective states of mind need not be at all unconscious. Men do not take sides in controversy except as the result of *some* quite conscious reasonings, however defective such

reasonings may be, and indeed usually are, in a formal point of view.

As regards the definition of Chalcedon, Dr. Sanday pleads in mitigation of the modern hostile tone. He says truly that it was no slight thing to save the integrity and reality of Christ's manhood, even though it were done at some expense of logic. When he says, however, that it is not for us to blame Pope Leo and Pope Martin 'before we have got a coherent and consistent theory of our own that we can substitute for theirs,' he appears to me to suggest a principle which, if taken seriously, would put an end to all criticism of the past. Happily the principle occurs only in an *obiter dictum*, and is freely transgressed by its author in case of need. Two Natures, Two Energies, Two Wills in Christ—such categories 'are no longer as living as they were.' Who can help criticising them, whether he will or not? Among reasonable men, I suppose, there is little more difference here than may be represented by the varied order of words in a sentence. One says: The older language scarcely contents us now, but we should consider that at the time no other solution was possible. Another says: No other solution was possible, doubtless, but the older language must now be modernized. And into either form we may really put as much sympathy and historic sense, I feel, as we are capable of.

Students of nineteenth-century Christology ought to ponder some of the implications of the following passage in the third lecture; Dr. Sanday is at his best in such brief *aperçus*. 'There are in German three related terms which may be used in this connexion, and I think that they may be taken as each marking a distinct step above the other. The terms are Christus-Idee, Christus-Prinzip, and Christus-Person. I would venture to distinguish between them thus. The *idea* is the expression of a general truth; in this case the general truth of the intimate mutual relation of God and man, of Deity and Humanity. It is implied, but not directly expressed, that this idea embodies itself, or works itself out, in history. The term *principle*, as compared with idea, lays more stress on this active working out or realization; it brings to the forefront the fact that the idea is not a mere abstraction of the mind, but a working creative force in history. Both these terms are less heard of than they were. In their place we hear more now of the Christus-Person. I take it that this

is a clear gain. We come back at last to the real Christ—historic or (as we should say) supernatural.' As an expository clue to the last hundred years, this could hardly be improved. It not only helps memory but promotes insight. I cannot dwell on the fine feeling of the pages which bring back T. H. Green to us, pages for which Dr. Sanday will be thanked by many. No part of the book is written so plainly *con amore*; and nothing was better worth doing just now, when Green's figure tends to grow dim a little in the dust-clouds of modern philosophic strife. One feels that the treatment of Dorner and the Kenotic theologians is somewhat slight, not to say unfriendly, which is the more surprising that many people would be inclined to put Dr. Sanday himself rather close up to the Kenoticists in ultimate affinity. As a guide to the English literature of the subject, however, these pages (71-78) have much value. It is perhaps time that we should now disengage the principle of Kenosis from the details of its application in the familiar historic theories. When Dr. Sanday remarks that 'the formal theory of Kenosis rests upon an altogether insufficient basis, both biblical and historical,' he appears to be thinking of Thomasius and Gess or of some other detailed hypothesis which almost invites the fatal charge of theosophy, because it professes to explain such things as—even if real—never could be really known to any one. So far as I can see, however, we are brought back irresistibly to the idea of a real Kenosis—not merely Kenosis 'in a sense'—by motives which at bottom are genuinely religious. Somehow we must get into our theory the wonder of Christ's self-abnegation; the fact that in love He gave up qualities or conditions of a former being, gave them up besides by a real surrender, which was incompatible with His yet retaining them at a different centre of consciousness. And if we be asked what these qualities were, only the historic record of His life, I think, can tell us. He gave up whatever was necessary to His becoming *that*. At various points in his argument Dr. Sanday implies approval of the modern view that the life of Jesus was veritably human, and that—it is really a second aspect of the same thing—there were in Him not two consciousnesses or two wills, but a fundamental unity of experience; that, to quote Bishop Weston, 'the importance of arriving at a conception of a single consciousness of the Christ cannot

be overestimated.' But how to think these two data together—the true manhood and the single consciousness—without the postulate of an actual Kenosis, involving much more than 'the external circumstances of majesty and glory,' I confess to finding it always more difficult to understand.

The estimate of Ritschlianism is very much done from the inside. How sympathetic it is the following sentences prove. 'The formula on which [the Ritschlian] insists, and will insist as much as we please, is contained in those words of St. Paul's, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself" (2 Co 5<sup>19</sup>). His assent to this is whole-hearted. . . . To find Christ or be found of Christ, is to find God or be found of God; to be in touch with Christ is to be in touch with God, and to feel His presence in the soul. That is the religious nucleus of Ritschlianism, in regard to which, as I said just now, it is quite whole-hearted. And I confess that to me this profession of faith, brief and guarded as it is, is of immense value. I am not sure that it is not really the essence of everything' (pp. 104–105). This is surely as far as sincere mediation and compromise could go; and the difference which after all does remain is rather theological than religious. But the question we have still the right to put, is just whether the Ritschlian gets as much truth out of this absolute religious conviction as it actually holds. If faith is in touch with ultimate reality, and if for faith Jesus and God are one, the right inference would appear to be that the dualism introduced between Christ and God by the logical understanding is only provisional and temporary—one more consequence indeed of the fact that life, by its very idea, is the perpetual despair of thought, which comes halting slowly in the rear of vital experience. Jesus and God *are* one, alike for simple faith and for the ideal Dogmatic that shall transcend the oppositions of discursive thinking. *À propos* of Ritschl, by the way, is it quite correct to say (p. 83) that there is nothing distinctive in his treatment of the categories of Prophet, Priest, and King? It has usually been regarded as a happy originality in him to take the Kingship as the superior conception, with Prophethood and Priesthood as joint aspects or subdivisions; Christ being Priest in so far as He dealt with God for us, Prophet in so far as He dealt with us for God, and the title in each case covering the *whole* of what He was and did. This

is a great advance on anything that had been tried previously.

Again, the Ritschlians perhaps too much figure in Dr. Sanday's pages as a single homogeneous group. There are really very considerable differences; Haering and Julius Kaftan, for example, would say a good deal as to the pre-existence of Christ which Harnack and J. Weiss would incline strongly to disown. Apart from this, however, Dr. Sanday looks upon the Ritschlian point of view as illustrating one of the two main types of contemporary Christian thought. Of these he writes: 'I will call the one "full Christianity," and the other "reduced Christianity"; and each of these, as it seems to me, has a Christology of its own.' Roughly it may be said that the reduced Christianity confines itself to the Synoptics; the fuller type takes in all the rest of the New Testament, and particularly writers like St. Paul and St. John. Both parties might conceivably meet on the ground of the brief creed suggested by Dr. Denney from the 'fuller' side; but the distinction of the one reading from the other is by no means to be minimized. It would be fairly correct to say that the radical group are unanimous in discarding the mysticism of the New Testament; the apostolic emphasis on 'something *inclusive* in the life and mission of our Lord,' and even our Lord's own consciousness of His own universal and representative character, are scarcely permitted to have weight. Dr. Sanday quotes from Moberly and Du Bose memorable passages which bear out his own strongly mystical interpretation of all such Biblical data, adding that 'there was a time when I should have very much hesitated to give any kind of endorsement to this teaching myself.' Now it seems to him to be after all nothing more than a Christian application of the idea of Divine Immanence. Not only so; it furnishes 'an analogy which may go some way to explain other difficulties of the Incarnation.' What follows is important. 'The presence of this divine element, whatever it is—the Christian would say, the working of the Holy Spirit even in its highest degree—is seen to be no wise incompatible with the fullest humanity. . . . The full recognition of this fact will determine the shape of that constructive attempt at a modern Christology that I hope to offer' (pp. 132–133). Already we can see that the two predominant ideas in Dr. Sanday's new reading of our Lord's Person are

going to be those of the Mystic Union and the Subliminal Self, if indeed he would concede that they are two ideas, and not rather one. But the exposition of this theory in more detail, with whatever criticism may offer, must be deferred.

Looking backward, we can see that we have been under the leadership of a singularly and congenially appreciative mind. 'I am perhaps conscious of a certain call to offer to mediate,' are the writer's own words. This sympathy and knowledge are manifest throughout, and they enable him to be always courteously conciliatory without being complaisant. No wonder he is so widely trusted. True sympathy and a feeling for the delicacies of spiritual thought are, if not rare, at any rate never too abundant. Though much less common than before, the *hard* type of divine is still with us; sagacious, shrewd, circumstantial, business-like, sceptical of everything

that cannot be set down instantly in plain words. Paley, as a fond admirer once happily expressed it, 'had the credit of putting Christianity into a form which could be written out at examinations.' Now of all this Dr. Sanday is the antipodes: he has no dry, stony confidence in arguing with other men, never treats ideas as if they formed a fixed, dead skeleton, refuses to ignore the delicate organic laws of growth and change. At least I have noted but one exception to this rule of sympathy. That exception is Luther. He is mentioned only once, a little unkindly; and of his contributions to the interpretation of Christ there is not a word. And yet it is not too much to say that with the Reformation, and particularly with Luther, there came into the world a richer and more profound, because a more religious, understanding of our Lord's Person than had been known since the Apostles.

## The Great Text Commentary.

### THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

#### REVELATION XXII. 17.

'And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely.'

There are two kinds of 'coming' in this verse. There is the coming of the Saviour, and there is coming to the Saviour. First there is the invitation to the Lord Jesus Christ to come. The invitation is addressed to Him by the Spirit and the bride, and every one that hears is invited to join in it. And then there is the invitation to come to the Lord, or, as the expression is, to 'take the water of life freely,' an invitation which is addressed first to 'him that is athirst,' and next to 'whosoever will.' So we have—

#### I. The Invitation to Christ to come.

1. From the Spirit.
2. From the Bride.
3. From the Hearer.

#### II. The Invitation to the Sinner to come to Christ.

1. To the Thirsty One.
2. To every one that is willing.

#### I.

#### THE INVITATION TO CHRIST TO COME.

The invitation is given (1) by the Spirit, (2) by the bride, and (3) by the hearer. The Spirit and the bride are not identical, as if the Spirit simply spoke through the bride, that is, the Church. And yet the writer of the Apocalypse does not mean that the Spirit, as the third Person in the Trinity, gives the invitation directly to the second Person to hasten His coming. By the Spirit, St. John means those who are specially endowed with the spirit of wisdom and of utterance. There was in the early Church a distinct order or school of 'prophets' to whom the word of the Lord came, as it came to the prophets of the old dispensation. But it did not come from without. The word was in their heart. It was the Spirit within them; it was the Spirit of God expressing itself by them. People, says Dr. W. M. Macgregor, had the wisdom and the courage in those days to believe that in their lowly gatherings the voice of God was sometimes heard. When plain men spoke above themselves, in words all depth and fire and essential insight, speaking so as to catch their

fellows up to God, it was reverently confessed that the Spirit of God was speaking; and on the lips of these men who for the moment had the inspired utterance, the recurring word was 'Come, Lord Jesus.'<sup>1</sup> Then the bride, the whole Church of Christ, joined in the invitation. And last of all the hearer, every hearer of this book; not only the Church in her ideal unity, but each individual member of every Christian congregation where the book shall be read is invited to demand the fulfilment of the Lord's promise, 'Behold I come quickly.'

**I. The Invitation of the Spirit.**—'The Spirit says, Come.' It is true, indeed, that the spirit of this world and age does not speak thus. The more it strives after ease and comfort in this life, the further it is from wishing to have the present state of things ended by the coming of the Lord. But the Spirit of God and of Christ, which is meant here; the true spiritual life-throb of the children of God; the power of faith and salvation, of hope and patience, by which they fight their way victoriously through this world; this Spirit cries at all times, Come, Lord Jesus; come to our aid in every difficulty; come and advance Thy kingdom; even by the very obstacles raised by Thine enemies, come, and by Thine advent make an end to all sorrow and suffering! This Spirit, emanating as it does from eternity, implants in our hearts a holy longing after this eternity, and is itself the innermost strength of this holy longing, of this love for the Lord and His appearing. It is this same Spirit which creates a deep yearning for freedom from all the bonds of sin and death, and for entire unity with the Lord; which creates the burning desire to see the Church of Christ healed of all schisms and corruption, and the honour of the glory of the Lord made manifest before the whole world, and incontestably established for all eternity. Thus does the Spirit continually incite to the prayer, 'Come, Lord Jesus!' The Spirit cries and prays through the mouth of the Church, and in this cry the Church, in unison with the Spirit, pours forth her whole longing and yearning, as in Jn 15<sup>26, 27</sup>, 'The Spirit shall testify of me, and ye also shall bear witness.'

**2. The Invitation of the Bride.**—'And the bride says, Come!' This is not indeed the heart-cry of the whole visible Church; for in so far as she allows herself to be rocked to sleep by the spirit

of this world, she becomes, with all her hopes and wishes, so completely a citizen of this world that she wishes the day of the Lord may long be delayed, until she herself has enjoyed life. Therefore *she* does not say, or at least does not say from her heart, 'Come, Lord Jesus!' But the bride who has given herself wholly to the Lord, who keeps the covenant of faith which she has made with Him, and as His betrothed keeps herself unspotted from the world, who knows full well that the good things of this world are fair but poor and perishable, who knows that by the appearing of her Beloved a time of unclouded, endless joy and glory will dawn for *her*, *she* it is who says and prays with earnest longing, 'Come, Lord Jesus!'

Who is 'the Bride'? A beautiful body, knit together in one holy fellowship, pure and spotless, spotless in God's eyes for His sake who loves her, 'arrayed in the fine linen, which is the righteousness of the saints,' and decked with the ornaments of grace. She has accepted Christ for her Beloved, and is bound to Him in a perpetual covenant, never to be forgotten. In Him she has merged her name, her nature, her property, her being; while He pays all her debts, pledges Himself for all her wants, sustains her with His arm, satisfies her with His love. It is the Church, elected by grace, united by faith, sealed by baptism, kept by mercy, prepared for glory.

The Bride is represented here on earth. The Bride is represented there in glory:

One family we dwell in Him,  
One Church above, beneath;  
Though now divided by the stream,  
The narrow stream of death.

But, whether it is here on earth or yonder in glory, still the Bride speaks one language. Wherever you meet with a soul in whom there is the spirit of the Bride, and who belongs in God's eternal foreknowledge to that elect company, you will find one whose life is a continuous invitation; for, wherever the Bride is, she still seems to say, 'Come.'<sup>2</sup>

**3. The Invitation of the Hearer.**—Not all the Lord's people are prophets, not all within the Church are sharers in its hope, but there ought to be a process of infection by which the outsider in these matters begins to be interested at second hand, as it were, interested not in the object itself, but, at least, in his neighbour's interest. Many come by that way to the knowledge of Christ. On Stephen's face Paul saw a light which should not

<sup>1</sup> W. M. Macgregor, *Jesus Christ the Son of God*, 264.

<sup>2</sup> W. H. M. H. Aitken, *God's Everlasting Yea*, 242.

have been there if the Sanhedrin's view of the martyr were the true one; but 'light there was from far-off fountains' hid from Paul, making death itself a new and radiant thing. That caught Paul's eye and fretted his sense of what was fitting, but it also set him questioning; and one day he discovered the source of that strange brightness, and it seemed to him like the first day of creation, as fresh and startling as if a man had never looked on light before. That is how ideas move. They are like the seeds of plants meant for the winds to bear, scattering themselves by suggestion, not by direct instruction. There are eyes that look in the Church, and ears that listen; and the power and the awe of great sincere desires are felt by many who are not yet Christians in the deeper sense. A Church which comes to meet them half-way, on a footing of familiarity and lightness, has little power with men; but those who grow up in an atmosphere of noble longings are silently constrained to set amongst the objects of their own desire something of the same order. Though they cannot yet say, Come, they envy those who can; and thus they are drawn by admiration nearer to the Christian temper.<sup>1</sup>

'Let him that heareth say, Come.' I do not know of a better evangelist than a fresh convert. When the love of God is first shed abroad in our hearts, and we receive the fulness of His first blessing, it is so natural that we should go and tell other people of what the Lord has done for us. About three weeks after a mission had been held in the north of England, the mission preacher paid another visit to the neighbourhood, and asked those who had received benefit to meet him in the schoolroom of the church. One of the very first to come forward was a little boy. He came forward like a man, and held out his little hand and grasped the mission preacher by his. His eyes were sparkling with joy. 'Well, my dear boy, how are you getting on? Have you been doing the part of a mission preacher?' • 'Yes,' said the boy; 'and now, sir, we are all of one mind in our house, mother and brothers and sisters, all except father, and *we are bound to have him too.*'<sup>2</sup>

## II.

### THE INVITATION TO THE SINNER TO COME TO CHRIST.

Here we have a remarkable change. We pass at once, and quite abruptly, from an invitation to Christ to hasten His coming to an invitation addressed to those who are thirsty, and those who are

willing, to come to Christ. It is as if the writer had intended to ask the thirsty one and every one that had any good will at all, to join in the welcome to the coming Christ, and then suddenly remembered that that could not be until they knew Christ. So he turns his sentence into an invitation to them to come to Christ, that they may taste and see how gracious the Lord is. Then will they be ready to welcome His coming.

**I. The Invitation to the Thirsty One.**—There is no animal craving so fierce and so intolerable as the craving of thirst. This may be due to the fact that the deprivation of liquid is a condition with which all the tissues sympathize. Every atom of the body joins in the cry, and the expression is concentrated in the parched mouth, and the dry and feverish lips. And this great craving of thirst is used in this book to symbolize the craving of the soul, and these plenteous waters are used to shadow forth the abundance of the satisfaction which is found in the Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>3</sup>

A man felt this thirst, but was too proud to come. One evening after his wife had gone to a revival meeting, he was restless and walked the floor. His little girl asked, 'What ails you?' 'Nothing,' he said; but still he walked the floor. The girl, in her artless way, asked, 'If you were thirsty, would you not go and get a drink of water?' He felt that it was God saying, 'Let him that is athirst come.' He put his hat on, went to the meeting, and before he returned drank deeply from the water of life.<sup>4</sup>

Will anything allay this thirst? 1. Not *sin*. The wonderful thing is that we can ever persuade ourselves that it can. But the devil can mix the most insidious potions and can make them sparkle like the water of life, but when we drink them it is as though a man consumes salt water to appease his thirst. Animal gratification can never quench a spiritual craving. It is the most pathetic of all tragedies when a man or woman flees to drink to quieten his soul. It shall be 'as when a thirsty man dreameth, and behold he drinketh; but he awaketh, and behold he is faint, and his soul hath appetite.'

2. Nor *work*. I will join any man, says Jowett, in singing a pæan of blessedness on work; but if hard work will lead to spiritual contentment, the great majority of my congregation will be in the enjoyment of spiritual rest. And yet after the

<sup>1</sup> W. M. Macgregor, *Jesus Christ the Son of God*, 270.

<sup>2</sup> W. H. M. H. Aitken, *God's Everlasting Yea*, 245f.

<sup>3</sup> J. H. Jowett, in *The British Congregationalist*, September 24, 1908.

<sup>4</sup> W. Armstrong, *Five-Minute Sermons to Children*, 112.

hardest day's work, often in the midst of it, there is a sigh, a weariness, a state of staleness, a certain out-of-jointness, which is abundant proof that the old craving is still there like a smoking volcano, and that its inner fires are not yet quenched. Thank God for work, but work can never take the place of God.

3. Nor *money*. The most awful weariness in the world to-day will be found where money abounds. The fact of the matter is, spiritual satisfaction is to be obtained at a counter where money is not accepted as a means of exchange. 'Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God can be purchased with money.'

4. Nor *honour*. Satisfaction cannot be found even in the higher and finer cultures of the mind, in music and art and literature. These ministries can soothe, they can excite, they can gratify, but they cannot satisfy; and when the volume is closed, when the harmonious strains have died away, when the creations of art have been laid aside, the secret yearning asserts itself, and the unsatisfied soul cries out, 'I thirst!'

5. 'If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink.' The Lord Jesus claims to satisfy the soul; yes, to satisfy the soul as a babe is satisfied to find its mother's breast. 'The water that I shall give shall be in him a well.' The Lord creates a new well of peace and fruitful satisfaction. For, look you, solid satisfaction lies in the possession of a certain quality of spirit. What is that spirit? What sort of gift would send this congregation away in radiant triumph? If God were now to give me the choice as to what every member of this congregation should receive before we leave the building, what would I choose? I think I would choose three things. First of all, pardon; forgiveness for all our ill doings and all our wasted treasure. Secondly, purity; the washing away of all stains, the searching out of hidden germs and defilement. And thirdly, peace; the sense of the glorious at-one-ness with the glorious God. And if we obtained those three gifts, we should all go away with feet like hinds' feet. And these are just the gifts to be found in Christ. 'Let him come unto me and drink.' We should find pardon; 'in whom we have the forgiveness of sins.' We should find purity; 'He hath washed us from our sins in His own blood.' We should find peace; 'My peace I give unto you.' He is the fountain

of these secrets of blessedness. 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters.'<sup>1</sup>

2. The invitation to every one that has any will to come.—Behind the thirsty there is yet this other class who are invited to come—those who are willing. Willingness to receive the truth may exist where as yet there is no thirst for it, and such willingness is of God, and a first step towards eternal life.

This seems to include every one. But it does not. It excludes a great many persons. 'Whosoever *will*, let him take the water of life freely.' The Bible invitation turns on the human will. It invites every man that chooses, but there it stops. The Bible rests on the assumption that every man, if he enters into life, must enter into it by his own free choice.

God pays His child no finer compliment than when He trusts him with his destiny. There must be something inexpressibly great in man to merit this surpassing confidence. True, God was held by the alternative of making a race of automatons or a race endowed with choice; and He made the latter. It was counted that such a creature was worth all the cost of pain and woe, of evil and despair; worth the cost of Calvary. But God leaves us not alone: a highway of truth is blazed by revelation, sweet voices counsel us to walk thereon, an inner Spirit offers holy motive, and a Saviour takes the thrust of an avenging sword. Above, below, around, within us tender help is proffered; but no power may touch with lightest hand the sceptre of the soul. There in the throne-room man is master. A thousand ministries from heaven wait his nod; a thousand demons from the pit attend his will.<sup>2</sup>

If you ask me why the Queen is upon the throne, I reply in the words she insists should be on all her coins, 'Dei Gratia'—by the grace of God. But, on the other hand, if you ask me why yonder criminal is in the cell, I dare not reply, By the will of God; but I say, Because he has done wrong; and I insist that he is morally responsible, else you must not shut him up as a criminal. You may confine him as a lunatic, as one who is dangerous to society; but do not punish him as a criminal for what he had no power to avoid. No, these two things are quite compatible—the Divine sovereignty and the free agency of man; and herein consists the glory of God. He performs His purposes not by mere machines, but by living moral agents, who have this power of will. We all acknowledge that the power of the statesman, who moulds the will of the people, is of a higher

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Jowett, in *The British Congregationalist*, September 24, 1908.

<sup>2</sup> C. G. Doney, *The Throne-Room of the Soul*, 11.

order than the power of a blacksmith, who moulds a dead, resistless piece of iron to his purpose. So God carries out His own will, though liable to be crossed at every turn by the will of man.<sup>1</sup>

**The Water of Life.**—When we are roaming through the Bible we are never far away from the sound of waters. We have not gone far before we discover ‘a fountain of water in the desert’; there are wells on every hand; water gushes forth out of the rock of flint. Away in the Psalms there is ‘a river which maketh glad the city of God’; we sit in the shadow of trees which are planted by the flowing streams. In Isaiah there are ‘wells of salvation’; rivers breaking out in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys; the wilderness becomes a pool, and the dry land springs of water. And so on by the ‘great waters’ of Ezekiel, and the clear, strong mountain streams of Amos. On by the well of ‘living water’ in John, to the sunlit fountains of the Apocalypse. Yes, the sound of the book is as ‘the sound of many waters,’ and we are never beyond the reach of their voice. And so everywhere there is a promise of refreshment, of satisfaction, the offer of sweet, plentiful waters to allay the thirst of man.

The spiritual drink comes from the Spiritual Rock, says Paul, on which Bengel’s comment is, ‘Qualis Petra, talis aqua,’ what the Rock is in quality that also is the water which comes from it. So when you gaze on Christ and realize what He is, you may be well assured that from Him no mean or meagre gift can come, but one which will give life and death another look.

In the desert when a caravan runs short of water they sometimes send the swiftest camel with its rider forth to seek for it. And the camel’s unerring instinct guides it in the direction of the well. When it is nearly out of sight—only a speck on the horizon, they send out another camel and its rider, and when he is afar, they send another and another, and another. And when the first camel reaches the wells, its rider leaps to earth, and stoops and tastes the water to see if it is sweet, and if it is, he mounts once more and turns and waves his hand to the next rider, and shouts, ‘Come!’ and when he sees the signal and hears the shout, he wheels and rides back, crying, ‘Come!’ and the next man does the same, and the next, and the next, until the desert rings again with shouts of ‘Come, Come, Come!’ and the travellers rise and hasten gladly to the living spring.

**Freely.**—We use the word ‘freely’ for that which is given without money and without price. It is

<sup>1</sup> E. A. Stuart, *Children of God*, 162.

opposed to all idea of bargaining, to all acceptance of an equivalent, or that which might be construed into an equivalent. A man is said to give freely when he bestows his charity on applicants simply on the ground of their poverty, hoping for nothing again. A man distributes freely when, without asking any compensation, he finds it more blessed to give than to receive. Now God’s love comes to men all free and unbought; without our having merit to deserve, or money to procure it. I know it is written, ‘Come, *buy* wine and milk,’ but is it not added, ‘Without money and without price?’ ‘I will love them freely’; that is, ‘I will not accept their works in barter for my love; I will not receive their love as a recompense for mine; I will love them, all unworthy and sinful though they be.’

The Trevi Fountain stands in a busy part of Rome. It is in the Strangers’ Quarter, but also not far from the Palace of the Quirinal, where the King of Italy resides. It is one of the sights of the city which every tourist goes to see. The present structure is built as a front of marble to one of the old Roman palaces, and was completed in the year 1762. The water gushes out with great force, and the basin into which it is poured fills nearly the whole of the public square. The aqueduct yields daily at its three outlets thirteen million cubic feet of water. ‘It is interesting,’ says a recent writer, ‘to watch the people flocking to the Trevi Fountain. People from the country are there: they are thirsty, and turn aside to quench their thirst. Maidens from the city are there, carrying their pitchers, and bearing them away, when filled, on their heads. The cigar dealer from his shop stands side by side with an English lord. The fruit woman from her stall has as her next companion a grandly dressed duchess. Newspaper boys, travellers, young and old, rich and poor, are all at the fountain, and they have an equal right to it. It is free to all.’<sup>2</sup>

**Whosoever will.**—‘Thank God,’ said Richard Baxter, ‘for that “whosoever.” Had it been—“Let Richard Baxter take,” I might have doubted if I were meant; but that “whosoever will” includes me, though the worst of all Richard Baxters.’

A visitor to Dr. Horatius Bonar’s church (about 1876) says: ‘His address was founded on the words “The Spirit and the bride say, Come”—“the last invitation in the Bible.” It was marked by the absence of all attempt at originality. It was simply an invitation—warm, loving, urgent. With one of the most winning faces I ever saw, he closed: “Whosoever—that includes *you*: whosoever *will*—does *that* include you?”’

<sup>2</sup> C. Jerdan, *Pastures of Tender Grass*, 255 f.

## On Maps of Palestine containing Ancient Sites.

BY THE REV. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, OXFORD.

IN the ordinary course of things, if one wants to know the position of some not very well-known place, one looks it out in a map, and with the help of an index the place is quickly found, and there is no more question about it. By this simple method, the site of any place, sufficiently important to be upon the map at all, be it in the remotest corner of the world, is readily ascertained. But maps of Palestine are unfortunately unlike the maps of any other country; and the appearance upon one of them of a given place is no guarantee whatever that it ever existed on the site shown. In other words, nearly every map of Palestine contains a greater or less number of purely imaginary sites.

I will demonstrate this by the examples of Luḥith and Jazer, both mentioned in the prophecy of Moab contained in Is 15-16. It must be obvious that any description of the movements of an army or other body of men becomes much more intelligible and real, if the course taken by them can be followed on the map: so the first question which a student of Is 15-16 naturally asks himself is, Where were the places mentioned in it situated? Let us see what help the maps give us on the sites of Luḥith and Jazer.

It must be admitted at the outset that the most recent English maps of Palestine are particularly liberal in the matter of Luḥith, for they offer us *two* sites for it. In G. A. Smith's large map of Palestine, the 'Ascent of Luḥith' is placed just W. of Nebo, E. of the north end of the Dead Sea. In Armstrong's *Names and Places in the O.T. and N.T. and Apocrypha*, published by the P.E.F., Luḥith is located in the same place, with a mark indicating that the discovery of the site is a gain due to the explorations of the P.E.F., and without any indication whatever that the identification is insecure. But in the map at the beginning of the invaluable *Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by Dr. Hastings, while Luḥith (in type indicating that it is a *modern* name) is placed here, Luith (in type indicating that it is an *ancient* name,—though, of course, the two forms are in reality just the same name differently spelt) is placed 30 miles to the S., a little E. of the Liṣān, or tongue of land pro-

jecting into the Dead Sea, on the site of the modern 'Sarifa.' The map of Palestine in Murray's *Classical Maps* gives the southern Luith in the same position, but is silent as to the Luḥith in the north. In none of these maps is there any mark of interrogation, or other note, indicating doubt as to the correctness of the sites. As, however, it is too much to believe that the same place had two sites, the intelligent reader of Isaiah's prophecy on Moab, with this *embarras de richesses*, must pursue his investigations further, so as to discover, if possible, which of his authorities gives the more probable site.

The *northern* site is adopted presumably from the P.E.F.'s 'Old and New Testament Map of Palestine' in 20 sheets, on the scale of  $\frac{3}{8}$  in. to the mile, containing the names of both modern sites and their supposed ancient equivalents. The 'Ascent of Luith' is marked in it, as on G. A. Smith's map, without any indication that it is doubtful. But what are the grounds on which the identification rests? To discover these, we must turn to the *Survey of Eastern Palestine*, published by the P.E.F., pp. 228, 253. We there learn that the modern name of the place is *Tal'at Heisah*, the 'Ascent of Heisah' (تالعات عيسا: the map in *D.B.*, in giving the modern name as *Luḥith*, is thus incorrect), or, with the art., *el-Heisah*; and this, we are told, 'may be a corruption of the Heb. Luḥith' (!). In this equation, phonetics and probability are nowhere. The ascent of Luḥith, it is added, 'might very well be that leading up to the plateau near Nebo.' And so it might equally well be an ascent leading up to any other plateau or height in Moab. These, however, are the flimsy reasons upon which alone, so far as appears, in the P.E.F. map mentioned *Tal'at Heisah* is identified, as a *certainty*, with the ancient Luḥith! That such reasons should have satisfied the accomplished and judicious author of the *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* and of *Jerusalem*, is more than can be credited: we can, rather, only suppose that his attention was not called to the point, and that he accepted without inquiry the identification of the P.E.F.

The *southern* site for Luḥith, we learn from

Buhl, *Geographie*, p. 272, was first suggested by De Saulcy.<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, in his *Onomasticon* (276. 43), makes the important statement that in his day there was a village between Areopolis and Zoar called *Loueitha*. The site of Areopolis is known: it is the modern *Rabba*, E. of the Dead Sea, a little S. of the parallel  $31^{\circ} 20'$  (see G. A. Smith's map; in the P.E.F. map, the map in *D.B.*, and Murray's map, identified wrongly with Ar-Moab).<sup>2</sup> The site of Zoar has been disputed; but, whatever may have been the site of the Biblical Zoar, the Zoar known to Eusebius, like the Zoar known both to Josephus and to the mediæval Arabs, was, beyond question (see ZOAR in *D.B.*), at the S.E. end of the Dead Sea. 'As now the old Roman road from the E. coast of the Dead Sea to the Moabite plateau passed through the Wady Beni-Ḥammād, N. of Kerak [see G. A. Smith's map, with the note at the end of this article], we shall have to seek the ancient Luhith there, perhaps in the considerable ruins of Sarfa, described by De Saulcy, on the uppermost terrace of the mountain edge. Whether, however, the name of the mountain on which they lie, *Jebel en-Nouêhin*, or *Nouêhid*, is, as he supposes, connected with Luhith, the ancient name of the city, is very questionable. Everywhere there are clear traces of the old Roman road with its walls on the sides' (Buhl, p. 272).

Without in the least relying upon the doubtful identity of the name, the site thus suggested would seem, from the description, to be not unsuitable as a *conjectural* site for Luhith. De Saulcy describes his route minutely. He comes up from the Dead Sea to Adjerrah (or el-Djerrah); proceeding thence in a N.E. direction, he reaches a spot where there is a well, Bir el-Ḥafayeh, on his right, and, about 3 kils. in front, the Jebel en-Nouêhin (or Nouêhid), at the top of which the elevated Moabite plateau begins. Ascending the lower plateaus of this mountain, and turning to the S., he soon passes on his right the ruins of Ḥafayeh (called also by the Bedawin *el-Djerrah*), where he passes the night. Next morning he climbs up the rest of Jebel en-Nouêhin, and reaches

the Moabite plateau; here, on his left, begin the extensive ruins of Sarefah, through which his route passes for some distance, having parallel to it, on the right, hardly 150 metres off, the Wady ebni-Hamid. After emerging from the ruins of Sarefah, he proceeds in an E. and N.E. direction towards Foukoua and Shihan, the Wady ebni-Hamid diverging towards the S., and soon being as much as 2 kils. on his right. The entire route from Adjerrah to Shihar shows extensive remains of an ancient paved road, with walls on each side; there are also many ruins, besides those mentioned, showing that the region was once well populated.<sup>3</sup>

When, however, we take the detailed and, apparently, carefully constructed map<sup>4</sup> of Alois Musil, accompanying his elaborate work, *Arabia Petrea*<sup>5</sup> (1907), and endeavour to trace on it the route thus circumstantially described, we find it, strange to say, impossible to do so. Shihan is there (about 12 kils. north of Rabba); there is a Faḳu'a (obviously = Foukoua), about 5 kils. W. of Shihan; and  $6\frac{1}{2}$  kils. S.W. of Faḳu'a there is Ḥafāyer el-Jerra, which must correspond to the 'Ḥafayeh,' also called 'el-Djerrah,' of De Saulcy; but here the correspondence ceases. There is no 'Jebel en-Nouêhin' or 'Nouêhid' at all. Sarefa, which De Saulcy places very near Ḥafayeh, on the N.E., is in Musil's map a little S. of E. of it, and apparently on a different height altogether; and, most remarkable of all, W. Beni-Ḥammād (which must be De Saulcy's W. ebni-Hamid), instead of being only 150 metres to the S. of Sarefah, is 6 kils. (nearly four miles) to the S., and separated from Sarefa by another considerable wady (Seil el-Minka'a) as well! The wady which De Saulcy ascended to Sarefa seems to correspond to one on Musil's map, called on p. 89 Wady Jar'ûb, leading up from the Dead Sea to Ḥafāyer el-Jerra: certainly the W. Beni-Ḥammād does not lead up in that direction at all, but, four miles to the S., almost straight up in the direction of Rabba. And if Sarfa is at all in the position in which it is placed by Musil—10 kils. (=6 miles) N.W. of Rabba,

<sup>3</sup> De Saulcy, i. 307–312, 314, 317–323, 325, with the map (Planche IX), which should be carefully compared. The description is very minute, the times when each spot was reached being carefully noted, and the relevant distances and directions regularly stated. The route is described in the text above only in the barest outline.

<sup>4</sup> See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xviii. 323; cf. 549.

<sup>5</sup> See G. A. Smith, *Expositor*, July and August 1908.

<sup>1</sup> See De Saulcy, *Voyage autour de la Mer Morte* (1853), ii. 42 f.

<sup>2</sup> Nu 21<sup>15</sup> 22<sup>36</sup> (if, as is probable, עִיר מוֹאב, the 'City of Moab,' is the same as עִיר מוֹאב, Dt 2<sup>18</sup>, show that Ar must have been on or near the upper course of the Arnon, on the E. border of Moab (so Dillmann, Gray, G. A. Smith, *E.B.* s.v. AR, etc.). Areopolis (*Rabba*) was in the centre of Moab.

with more than one intervening wady—it is difficult to understand how it could be at all on the natural route between Rabba and Zoar, at the S.E. end of the Dead Sea.

I do not pretend to be able to explain the discrepancies between De Saulcy and Musil; I shall be satisfied if I have written enough to lead the next commentator on Is 15 to pause before he identifies Şarfa with Luḥith. Buhl, writing in 1896 (the date of his *Geographie*), was justified, on the strength of De Saulcy's statements, in accepting Şarfa as a *possible* site for Luḥith (notice his 'perhaps'); but whether it can still be maintained, in face of the positions and measurements given by Musil, is the question which will now have to be considered. Musil himself (p. 75) remarks that Râs el-Fâs, or el-Râs (*ibid.* p. 72),  $2\frac{1}{2}$  miles S.E. of the S.E. corner of the Dead Sea, might, so far as the situation goes, be Luḥith. If the *Onomasticon* is to be trusted, Luḥith will have been on an ascent<sup>1</sup> somewhere on the road between Rabba

<sup>1</sup> The context in Is. seems to show that we want an ascent that would be climbed by those *leaving* Moab. Conversely, Ḥoronaim (Is 15<sup>b</sup>) would be at the bottom of some declivity (see Jer 48<sup>b</sup>) leading down on the S. or S.W. from the

and the Zoar known to Eusebius. With our present knowledge, it must be obvious, nothing more definite can be said. As the name does not appear to have been preserved, we must, even to fix conjecturally its position, more closely ascertain first what would be the natural route between those two places, and then what are the principal ascents on that route.<sup>2</sup> The northern site, considered above, must, of course, be unconditionally abandoned.<sup>3</sup>

high Moabite plateau. Cf. Mesha's inscription, l. 32, where Chemosh says to Mesha, 'Go down, fight against Ḥoronên.'

<sup>2</sup> Whether the Luḥitho mentioned in a Nabatæan inscription from Mēdebah is the Luḥith of Is 15 is uncertain. See Cooke, *North-Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 248.

<sup>3</sup> If Musil's measurements are correct, both Rabba and W. Beni-Hamid (Iḥammād) are, in the P.E.F. map and G. A. Smith's map, too far to the N., and the latter on these maps, leading up to Mejdelain, really corresponds to Musil's Seil Mink'a'a (leading up to Mejdelên); and in the map in *D.B.* Rabba is slightly, and Şarfa is a good deal, too far to the south. In Musil's map, Rabba is very slightly *south* of the south end of the bay formed by the north projection (ending at Point Costigan) of the promontory el-Lisân; and Şarfa is very slightly S. of the latitude of Point Costigan. The map in *E.B.* (*s.v.* MOAB) rightly omits Luḥith altogether.

(To be continued.)

## In the Study.

### Gospel.

IN his *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (2nd ed. 1884), Skeat derives the English word 'gospel' from the Anglo-Saxon *gód*, 'God,' and *spell*, 'a story,' 'history,' 'narrative.' Thus the literal sense, he says, is the 'narrative of God,' that is, the life of Christ. Then, he says, 'It is constantly derived from A.S. *gód*, 'good,' and *spell*, 'story,' as though *gód spell* were a translation of Gk. *εὐαγγέλιον*.' But Skeat himself proceeds to show that in the *Ormulum* (Introd. 157), written when Anglo-Saxon was not yet forgotten, the word is used in the sense of the Gk. *εὐαγγέλιον*, 'good news.' The words are '*Goddspell* onn Ennglissh nemmedd iss god word and god tithennde,' *i.e.* 'Gospel is named in English good word and good tiding.' Marsh had already pointed this out, and had quoted another example from the *Ormulum* (Introd. 175) and one from Layamon

(iii. 182). The example from Layamon is, *And beode ther godes godd-spel*, *i.e.* 'and preach there God's gospel,' a phrase, says Marsh, not likely to be employed if 'gospel' had been understood to mean of itself 'God's story,' or the life of Christ. On the other hand, Marsh points out that in Continental Old Saxon 'gospel' undoubtedly meant the life of Christ, and only the life of Christ (see *Student's English Language*, 2nd ed. 1863, p. 26).

Murray has settled the question.<sup>1</sup> The word, he says, doubtless originally was *gód spel*, that is, 'good tidings,' being a rendering of the Lat. *bona adnuntiatio*, which was current as an explanation of Lat. *evangelium*, Gk. *εὐαγγέλιον*. But when the word passed into the languages of the Teutonic peoples evangelized from England, it was adopted as the translation of *evangelium*, which at the time meant chiefly one of the first four books of the New Testament, or a portion of the liturgy.

<sup>1</sup> In his new edition (1910) Skeat agrees.

We must therefore take the word as originally meaning 'good news,' like the Lat. *evangelium* and the Gk. *εὐαγγέλιον*. And when Emerson (*Brief History of the English Language*) compares *gospel*, 'God's story,' with *gossip*, i.e. *god sib*, 'related to God,' 'sponsor,' and with *goodbye*, 'God be wi' ye,' he is taking *gospel* in its secondary meaning. This secondary meaning probably arose from contracting the title 'the Gospel according to St. Matthew' into 'the Gospel of St. Matthew.'

But the Greek and Latin words were both used in the secondary sense. Trench says that the earliest occurrence of the Greek word as applied to the four inspired records of the ministry of our Lord is in Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 66). Yet how easily the one meaning could slip into the other is seen in *Peres the Ploughman* (343):

'Lere me to som man my crede for to lerne,  
That lyveth in lel lyf and loveth no synne,  
And glosseth nought the godspell';

or in Shakespeare (*Twelfth Night*, v. i. 295):

'A madman's epistles are no gospels.'

Becon says: 'The Greek word *evangelion*, which we call *gospel* in English, soundeth in our common tongue a good, joyful, and merry message' (*Works*, p. 113, Parker Soc.). But Becon's contemporary, Thomas Elyot, says: 'Nowe be we comen to the newe testament, and principally the bokes of the Euangelistes, vulgarely called the gospels' (*The Governour*, ii. 391); for both meanings have been in use throughout the history of the word.

Besides being translated into the purely English word 'gospel,' the Lat. *evangelium* was itself taken into English (through the French) in the form 'evangel.' The oldest example in Murray is from Hampole's *Psalter*, about 1340. Murray says that in England the word was, in the seventeenth century, already archaic and purely literary, but in Scotland remained in current use as a synonym for 'gospel' until a still later period. In addition to the examples in the *Oxford Dictionary*, and perhaps better than any of them, take this from Taverner's *Postils*, of date 1540 (Oxford ed. p. 248): 'The euangell or glad tydynges of oure saluation (whyche thyng we call commonly in Englyshe a gospel).'

Evangel has the advantage of being easily turned into a verb, 'evangelize,' and a personal subst. 'evangelist.' But 'gospel' itself could once be used as a verb, and there was a subst. 'gospeller.'

Sir John Cheke in Mt 11<sup>5</sup> has simply 'gospeld' for A.V., 'have the gospel preached to them'—'ye deed be raised, and ye beggars be gospeld.' 'Gospeller' was used for a preacher of the gospel, as well as for one of the four Evangelists. Wyclif's translation in Is 41<sup>27</sup> is 'to Jerusalem an evangelist I shal gyue,' which in Purvey's version becomes 'y schal gyue a gospellere to Jerusalem'; while in the preface to Matthew's Gospel, Wyclif says: 'Matheu that was of Judee, as he is set first in ordre of the gospelleris, so he wroot first the gospel in Judee.' In the old rubrics the gospeller is the reader of the gospel in the Communion Office.

In one of his sermons Thomas Adams tells this story (*Works*, i. 33). What does 'gospel' mean in it? 'A boy was molested with a dog; the friar taught him to say a gospel by heart, and warranted this to allay the dog's fury. The mastiff spying the boy, flies at him; he begins, as it were, to conjure him with his gospel. The dog, not capable of religion, approacheth more violently. A neighbour passing by bids the boy take up a stone; he did so, and throwing at the dog, escaped. The friar demands of the lad how he sped with his charm. "Sir," quoth he, "your gospel was good, but a stone with the gospel did the deed." The curs of Antichrist are not afraid of our gospel, but of our stones: let us fight, and they will fly.'

## Not Ashamed.

### I.

#### God not Ashamed.

He 11<sup>16</sup>, 'God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God.'

He was called the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and we are told that He was not ashamed to be called their God. When He appeared to Moses in Midian, He introduced Himself in this way—'I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' And when He sent him down into Egypt, 'Thus,' He told him, 'shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The LORD, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you.'

Why was He not ashamed to be called the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob? Because

they walked by faith, and not by sight. He is never called the God of Lot, the God of Ishmael, the God of Esau. He would have been ashamed to be called their God. For they walked by sight, and not by faith. Lot lifted up his eyes and saw all the Plain of Jordan that it was well watered everywhere, chose that, and settled there. And when Chedorlaomer and his allies harried the land, there was nothing left of all that Lot set his heart upon. Abraham became rich also. But he did not give his whole soul to the heaping up of wealth. When disappointed in one expectation, he found refuge in some more spiritual promise. When at last he discovered that the land of promise was not to be his, he looked for a City which had foundations, whose builder and maker was God. Esau had a choice between the birthright and the pottage. He chose the pottage. A bird in the hand, he would say, is worth two in the bush.

Two reasons are given why God was not ashamed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to be called their God. The first is that they looked for a City; the second, that He prepared for them a City. He would have been ashamed of them, if they had not looked for a City: He would have been ashamed of Himself, if He had not had a city prepared for them. He was not ashamed to be called their God, because to that spiritual Deep in them there was a corresponding spiritual Deep in Himself.

‘Deep calls to deep’;—man’s depth would be despair

But for God’s deeper depth: we sow to reap.  
Have patience, wait, betake ourselves to prayer:

Deep answereth deep.

## II.

### Christ not Ashamed.

He 2<sup>11</sup>, ‘He is not ashamed to call them brethren.’

If God is not ashamed to be called their God, Christ will not be ashamed to call them brethren. We should expect that. For they are the same persons. They are those who walk by faith, and not by sight, the Abrahams, Isaacs, and Jacobs of all time. He is not ashamed. ‘Behold my mother and my brethren,’ He said; ‘for whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.’

Still it is a further revelation. For we are told that God is bringing many sons to glory, and for that end has provided a Captain of their salvation. He is no longer waiting, if we may say so, to receive them when they come. He has provided a passport, and furnished them with a guide.

And it is a further revelation in another way. For now we see the kind of City which God has prepared for them. It is a home. It is a family hearth. He is not only their God, but their Father. And the Son of His love is not ashamed to call them brethren.

But there are three reasons given why Christ is not ashamed to call them brethren. The first reason is that He and they are of one God and Father. There is a certain distinction yet, it is true. He teaches them to say ‘Our Father’; but He does not yet say ‘Our Father’ with them. He says ‘My Father and your Father.’ For they have not reached home yet. They do not yet know the might of the power of the Father’s love. It is His will—‘Father, I will,’ He says, ‘that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory—for thou lovedst me from the foundation of the world.’ When they understand the glory of a love like that and respond to it, then perhaps He will be able to say ‘Our Father’ with them. But meanwhile He is not ashamed to call them brethren, because He can say ‘My Father and your Father.’

The next reason is that He and they have the same experience in life. He is made like unto His brethren in this. He is tempted in all points like as they are. He takes up His cross, saying, ‘Not my will, but thine be done.’ They take up their cross and follow Him. They are even crucified with Him. And being crucified with Him, they rise with Him into a new life. There is nothing that makes good fellows like misfortune. The experience of life for Him and for them is a series of disappointments. If they were rich and He poor, He might be ashamed to call them brethren. But they wear the garb of the mendicant together. For He who was rich, for their sakes became poor, and He is not ashamed to call them brethren.

The third reason is that they reach the same home at last. Dale tells us in his *Life* that he never dared to call Jesus brother until he lost his own only brother. When his brother reached

the Home, he dared to call the other 'Brother.' 'I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am, there ye may be also.' Both at home. In the Father's House. He has willed it, and He has won it, and He is not ashamed to call them brethren.

### III.

#### Paul not Ashamed.

Ro 1<sup>16</sup>, 'I am not ashamed of the gospel.'

It is rather amusing to hear the Apostle say this. It is almost as if he had said, I am not ashamed of Christ. It is almost as if he had said, I am not ashamed of God. Still it is not quite the same. For what is the gospel? It is not simply the bringing of many sons to glory; it is the effort to persuade men to become sons. It is not the Abrahams, Isaacs, and Jacobs of this world walking majestically by faith and being received into the prepared City. It is the despised and the degraded, the earthly, the sensual, the devilish; it is the Lots, the Ishmaels, the Esaus of this world under earnest appeal to abandon their earthliness, and seek those things which are above. Now in Paul's day any appeal to these was looked upon with suspicion or contempt. The bottom dog was left at the bottom. 'This people that knoweth not the law is cursed.' If Paul had been visiting those cities where the Jews had planted themselves to encourage their Abrahams, their Isaacs, and Jacobs to walk by faith, and not by sight, he would have been well received. But he brings a crucified Messiah for the salvation of the outcast. And when we see the situation, we see that there is less room for laughter than for tears.

He gives three reasons for not being ashamed. First, the gospel is the power of God. Now, as he says elsewhere, even the weakness of God is stronger than men. How much stronger, then, must His power be. We are not ashamed of power. It is of weakness that we are ashamed. If Paul can prove that the gospel is really the power of God, he has certainly no reason to be ashamed of it.

The second reason is that it is the power of God unto salvation. This is not so evident a reason for not being ashamed of the gospel. For salvation is not so universally admired as power is. His countrymen had very clear ideas about salvation. There were just two classes of people in

the world—the righteous and the sinners. The righteous were saved already, by the keeping of the law. They did not need salvation. The sinners needed it very much, but they did not deserve it, and they would never get it. Paul said he was not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, because it was the power of God unto salvation. Salvation for whom? they asked. Then he gave his third reason.

The third reason is that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. And that there might be no mistake he added, 'To the Jew first, and also to the Greek.' He meant to say that there is no Jew that does not need it, and no Greek. He meant to say that there is no Jew that may not have it, and no Greek. He may well say, 'I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ.'

It is a further revelation. We have seen Abraham on the way to the City which hath foundations, and God is not ashamed to be called his God. We have seen God bringing many sons to glory, and for that end making the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. And the Captain is not ashamed to call the rank and file His brethren. But now we hear of a gospel for the waif and the stray, a gospel that goes into the byways to find the abandoned and the abominable, a gospel with a power of appeal that is called compelling them to come in. It is not that Lydia is to be neglected; it is that the keeper of the prison in the same city is to be remembered.

### IV.

#### Little Children not Ashamed.

1 Jn 2<sup>28</sup>, 'And now, my little children, abide in him; that if he shall be manifested, we may have boldness, and not be ashamed before him at his coming.'

Who are these 'little children'? They are not those who always kept the commandments and did not need salvation. They are those who needed it, who did not deserve it, and were supposed never to find it. They were once 'far off'; now they are 'made nigh.' From being sinners of the Jews, from being aliens of the Greeks, they have become 'little children.' The gospel has been to them the power of God unto salvation.

And now what wait they for? Simply for His manifestation. They wait for the triumphal entrance into the City. And although God is not

ashamed to be called their God ; although Christ is not ashamed to call them brethren ; although by the power of God they are now enjoying salvation : still their salvation is not yet complete, there is the possibility that even yet they may be ashamed at His coming.

For in all the intercourse of God with man, He uses no compulsion except the compulsion of love.

If one who has tasted and seen that the Lord is gracious feels constraint, it is the love of Christ that constrains him. And he must will to abide within the constraint of that love. He must, in the Apostle's words, 'abide in him,' in close conscious contact, that he may not be ashamed at His coming, but may have an abundant entrance into His eternal kingdom and glory.

## Two Old Testament Commentaries.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., ABERDEEN.

1. EXACT scholarship, a scientific temper of mind, and the reverence of a believer in Divine revelation combine to render Principal Skinner an ideal commentator on the Book of Genesis. The work before us will unquestionably take its place in the very front rank of modern O.T. commentaries. We can award it no higher praise than to say that it need not shrink from comparison with what has hitherto been *facile princeps* in the series to which it belongs—Driver's *Deuteronomy*. Before proceeding to deal with other features of this great work, we may note two respects in which even our acquaintance with Dr. Skinner had hardly prepared us to expect him to reach such excellence—namely, the literary style, which is not only clear and lucid but frequently reaches true eloquence ; and the consummate skill and unflinching courtesy with which he treats opponents. We confess we had looked for a little more of that 'impatience with stupid people' which used to be attributed to the late Professor Robertson Smith. But Dr. Skinner's is no doubt the more excellent way. Not, indeed, that he cannot, when necessary, give play to a mild sarcasm. What, for instance, could be more charming than this touch? : 'What with Winckler and Jeremias, and Cheyne, and now Eerdmans, O.T. scholars have a good many "new eras" dawning on them just now. Whether any of them will shine unto the perfect day, time will show' (p. xliii).

Hitherto the best commentaries on *Genesis* at the disposal of the English-speaking student have been the translation of Dillmann's great work (T. & T. Clark, 1897), and the admirable *Westminster Commentary* of Driver. Our debt to Dillmann we should find it hard to estimate, but a considerable change has passed on the situation since his day ; while Dr. Driver would be the first to admit that the 'Westminster' series denied him that scope of which Dr. Skinner has been able to avail himself in the 'International Critical' series. As for recent German commentaries, with all their excellence, we confess to have missed precisely what we find in the pages of Dr. Skinner's work. Take even the great work of Gunkel. In spite of its brilliance and suggestiveness, is there not a good deal of the wildly erratic in its theories and combinations, and is not an uneasy suspicion at times awakened in the mind of the cautious student that the ingenious author of *Schöpfung und Chaos* has discovered a mare's nest?

Most readers will be heartily glad that Dr. Skinner passes over so lightly the controversies as to the compatibility of the earlier chapters of *Genesis* with the conclusions of modern science. All such questions will soon cease, if they have not already ceased, to possess any living interest. Far more importance attaches to the question of the historical or legendary character of the book, or the relation of one of these elements to the other. Here Dr. Skinner is seen at his best, and we shall be sorely disappointed if his carefully weighed words fail to reassure some timid souls. For instance, in contrasting history with legend,

<sup>1</sup> THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY.—1. *Genesis*, by Principal Skinner, D.D., Westminster College, Cambridge, 1910. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; price 12s. 6d. 2. *Chronicles*, by Professor E. L. Curtis, D.D., Yale, with the assistance of Rev. A. A. Madsen, Ph.D., Newburgh, N.Y.; price 12s.

and defining the true character of the latter, he says:

'While legend is not history, it has in some respects a value greater than history. For it reveals the soul of a people, its instinctive selection of the types of character which represent its moral aspirations, its conception of its own place and mission in the world; and also, to some indeterminate extent, the impact on its inner life of the momentous historic experiences in which it first woke up to the consciousness of a national existence and destiny' (p. iv).

Dr. Skinner finds no difficulty in proving that in this sense much of the material contained in the early chapters of Genesis represents legend and not history, while at the same time it is possible, he argues, by the exercise of due care to extract solid historical results from a tradition that is mainly legendary. As to the presence of myths in Genesis, our author accepts as correct 'for all practical purposes' the view that the Hebrew mind did not produce myths of its own, but borrowed and adapted those of other peoples. This point is illustrated in detail (p. viii ff.).

A question of fundamental interest and importance to many readers will be that of the historical background of the *patriarchal traditions*. Nothing could surpass in fairness Dr. Skinner's treatment of the claims that have been put forward by recent apologists on archaeological grounds. He shows exactly what archaeology has proved and what it has left as much open to question as before. As to the *personalities* of the patriarchs, he examines carefully the theories that they were originally personified tribes, or that they were originally Canaanite deities. The cases of Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph are doubtful, although even here the *possibility* of an individual as opposed to a tribal origin of the names is not excluded; but Abraham has a claim to individuality that is all his own. On this point Dr. Skinner expresses so well the present writer's own conviction on the subject that it will be best to quote his words:

'An important element in the case is the clearly conceived type of *character* which he (Abraham) represents. No doubt the character has been idealized in accordance with the conceptions of a later age; but the impression remains that there must have been something in the actual Abraham which gave a direction to the idealization. It is this perception more than anything else which invests the figure of Abraham with the significance which it has possessed for devout minds in all ages, and which still resists the attempt to dissolve him into a creation of religious phantasy. If there be any truth in the description of legend as a form

of narrative conserving the impression of a great personality on his age, we may venture, in spite of the lack of decisive evidence, to regard him as a historic personage, however dim the surroundings of his life may be' (p. xxv).

And again (p. xxvii): 'The appearance of a prophetic personality such as Abraham is represented to have been, is a phenomenon with many analogies in the history of religion. The ethical and spiritual idea of God which is at the foundation of the religion of Israel could only enter the world through a personal organ of Divine revelation; and nothing forbids us to see in Abraham the first of that long series of prophets through whom God has communicated to mankind a saving knowledge of Himself. The keynote of Abraham's piety is *faith* in the unseen,—faith in the Divine impulse which drove him forth to a land which he was never to possess; and faith in the future of the religion which he thus founded. He moves before us on the page of Scripture as the man through whom faith, the living principle of true religion, first became a force in human affairs. It is difficult to think that so powerful a conception has grown out of nothing. As we read the story, we may well trust the instinct which tells us that here we are face to face with a decisive act of the living God in history, and an act whose essential significance was never lost in Israelite tradition.'

On the preservation and collection of the traditions and the structure and composition of the Book of Genesis, Dr. Skinner succeeds in formulating what is one of the most convincing arguments we have ever read in favour of the prevailing critical view. He appears to us to be especially successful in combating the objections of Dr. Orr (who, by the way, ought to have conceded nothing to his opponents if he was to escape finally conceding a great deal more), and the recent insidious attempts to invalidate the argument drawn from the varying use of the Divine names.

It may be of interest to note, finally, Dr. Skinner's view as to the date of the final redaction, when P<sup>g</sup> was amalgamated with JE (p. lxvi).

'If the lawbook read by Ezra before the congregation as the basis of the covenant (Neh 8<sup>ff.</sup>) was the entire Pentateuch (excepting late additions),<sup>1</sup> the redaction must have been effected before 444 B.C., and in all probability the redactor was Ezra himself. On the other hand, if (as seems to the present writer more probable) Ezra's lawbook was only the Priestly Code, or part of it (P<sup>g</sup> + P<sup>h</sup>),<sup>2</sup> then the final redaction is brought down to a later period, the *terminus ad quem* being the borrowing of the Jewish Pentateuch by the Samaritan community. That event is usually assigned, though on somewhat precarious grounds, to Nehemiah's second term of office in Judæa (c. 432 B.C.).

<sup>1</sup> So Wellhausen, Dillmann, Kittel, *et alii*.

<sup>2</sup> So Cornill, Holzinger, *et alii*.

On the sphere of the commentary proper (which extends to 540 pages) we cannot enter. It may suffice to say that, nothing is wanting for which the Old Testament student is entitled to look. He will find not only textual and literary criticism at the very highest level, archæology and comparative religion made to yield their latest and best results, exegesis of the safest and soundest type, but also a depth of spiritual insight which gives to this commentary quite a unique value. We should like to call attention, further, to the extremely important 'Extended Notes,' pre-eminent amongst which we have noted those on 'The Heb. and Bab. Sabbath,' 'The Chronology of Gn 5,' 'The Babel Legend,' 'Historical Value of Gn 14,' 'The Sacrifice of Isaac,' 'The "Shiloh" prophecy of Gn 49<sup>10</sup>,' 'The Zodiacal Theory of the Twelve Tribes.'

2. The pages of Professor Curtis's commentary introduce us to a very different class of religious literature. The Books of Chronicles are not specially popular with the ordinary reader of the Bible, and their real significance has not always been correctly appraised even by scholars. Dr. Curtis's difficulties in executing his task have been seriously increased by illness and partial loss of eyesight—a circumstance which necessitated the calling in of a coadjutor in the person of Dr. A. A. Madsen, whose work is fully recognized in the Preface. The Introduction contains a careful examination of the relation of Chronicles to Ezra-Nehemiah, and a discussion of the date of the work, which 'may be confidently given' as about 300 B.C. (p. 6). Proceeding to deal with the plan, purpose, and historical value, Dr. Curtis shows that the author of Chronicles belongs to the same school as the Priests' Code, delighting, equally with the latter, in all that pertains to the ministry of the sanctuary, showing the same fondness for registers and statistics, and indulging at times in similar exaggerations. The author's dominating motive is well defined as follows:

'He interpreted Israel's life, after the pattern of the Priests' Code of its national beginning under Moses, as that of a church with constant rewards and punishments through signal Divine intervention . . . . He made more universal the connection between piety and prosperity, and wickedness and adversity, heightening good and bad characters and their rewards and punishments, or creating them according to the exigencies of the occasion' (p. 9).

The method of procedure is illustrated in detail by the Chronicler's treatment of the history of the

various kings, as contrasted with the account given in the Books of Kings.

Owing to this deliberate reconstruction of the history, the Books of Chronicles are shown to be a 'tendency' composition possessing but little historical value.

'The picture which they give of the past is far less accurate or trustworthy than that of the earlier Biblical writings; indeed, it is a distorted picture in the interest of the later institutions of post-exilic Judaism; and the main historical value of these books consists in their reflection of the notions of that period. Yet at the same time some ancient facts, having trickled down through oral or written tradition, are doubtless preserved in the amplifications and embellishments of the Chronicler. . . . These are few, indeed, compared with the products of the imagination, and must be sifted like kernels of wheat from a mass of chaff' (p. 14 f.).

We are thoroughly at one with Dr. Curtis's appreciation of the Chronicler as a historian. It is important to bear in mind that none of the Old Testament writers—and least of all those of the Priestly school—wrote history *for its own sake*. Their aim was spiritual edification; they viewed themselves as interpreters of Divine providence; they gave rather a philosophy of history than history itself. Keeping this in view, and the pædagogic purpose served by the Law and its literary allies, we can conceive how the religious value of the Books of Chronicles may far surpass their religious value.

'The religious value of Chronicles lies in the emphasis given to the institutional forms of religion. Forms, ceremonies, institutions of one sort or another are necessary for the maintenance of religious life. The Chronicler, it is true, over-emphasized their importance, and his teachings are vitiated by a false doctrine of Divine interference without human endeavour, and a false notion of righteousness consisting largely in the observance of legal forms and ceremonies. Yet in his own time, unless he had been a direct forerunner of Christ, he could not have been expected to give a different message, and in his day his message rendered a most important service. He belonged not only to the same school of writers as the author or authors of the Priestly element of the Pentateuch, but was kindred with the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, and especially Malachi . . . . Through these writings the past also was idealized and glorified as a norm for present activity and future development. Nothing better than the authority of the past could have served in those days to intensify the loyalty and devotion of the ancient Jew. The Divine law of retribution and special providence, which the Chronicler taught, was a most powerful factor also for preserving the Jewish Church. It must also never be forgotten that it was under the tutelage of men like the Chronicler that the Maccabees were nourished, and that the heroic age of Judaism was inaugurated' (p. 16 f.).

Further sections in the Introduction deal very satisfactorily with such subjects as the sources (canonical and un-canonical) at the disposal of the Chronicler, the peculiarities of his diction, and the Hebrew text and the versions. An interesting account is given of what criticism has had to say on the Books of Chronicles, and a very valuable list of the Literature dealing with them is appended.

The commentary proper (473 pp.) deserves unstinted praise, and will be found of extreme value by all who are interested in this late constituent of the Canon, which possesses so much interest alike from the literary and the religious standpoint. Dr. Curtis has supplied the English-speaking student of the Old Testament with precisely the work he required.

## Another View of Professor Hilprecht's Fragment of a Deluge Tablet.

BY GEORGE A. BARTON, A.M., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND SEMITIC LANGUAGES IN BRYN MAWR COLLEGE, U.S.A.

THE treatment accorded this fragment of a Deluge tablet by two such distinguished scholars as Dr. Pinches and Professor Hommel in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May is very suggestive. As my own attention has, in consequence of previous studies, been attracted to points which seem, in part at least, to have escaped the notice of the scholars mentioned, a few words from a different point of view may not be out of place.

It should be noticed, in the first place, that the tablet is a mere fragment. No line of it is complete. Every one who interprets any line must resort in some degree to conjecture. A full discussion of Professor Hilprecht's conjectures will appear in an article soon to be published in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. I will here content myself with a few observations on line 12. There are visible but four signs in this line, namely, ku um mi ni. Hilprecht divides them ku-um mi-ni, translates them 'instead of a number,' supplies before this, 'and the creeping things two of everything,' making the whole read: 'and the creeping things two of everything instead of a number.' It is my belief that this whole procedure is untenable.

If we turn to Haupt's *Nimrodepos*, p. 138, lines 85, 86, we find that three classes of living beings went into the Babylonian ark. 'Cattle of the field, beasts of the field,' formed one class. Hilprecht's tablet gives this as 'beasts of the field and birds of heaven,' which forms a more beautiful line, and avoids tautology. Another class was the

family (*kimta*) of the Babylonian hero. This appears in the last line of Hilprecht's tablet as *kin-ta*. The third class was 'artisans' (*ummâni*). This third class we also find in l. 12 of Hilprecht's tablet if we join the last three syllables which appear there, *um-mi-ni*, and regard *ummini* as a variant form of *ummâni*, just as we have *kurummîti* for *kurummâti* and *shurminu* for *shurmânu*. The remaining syllable *ku* would then belong to the end of some lost word. That word may have been *li-il-li-ku*, since this word occurs in a similar connexion on the deluge fragment discovered by Père Scheil (cf. *Recueil de Travaux*, xx. p. 58, l. 20). The line would then mean 'let the artisans come.' It is surely a more scientific method of investigation to go to other accounts of the Deluge for suggestions as to how to read the signs and to fill out the lacuna than to assume that the signs which have survived introduce something new, and then to fill them out from the Old Testament.

If we adopt the reading suggested above, all claims that this fragment bears a unique witness to the text of the P document fall to the ground. The cuneiform does not even contain the word 'number' (*minu*), so that there is no occasion to discuss its relation to the word מִן. Delitzsch perceived in 1886 that מִן could not be 'number' in the Biblical passages, and withdrew this rash suggestion of his youth (cf. *Prolegomena*, p. 143), which Hilprecht has more rashly revived.

It is clear from the above remarks that the tablet has no significance for the Biblical student

over any other fragment of the Babylonian account of the Deluge. I also believe that it has no especial claim to notice on account of its superior antiquity. Professor Hilprecht dates it in the time of the dynasty of Isin between 2190-2000 B.C. His reasons are: (1) the stratum in which it was found; (2) the palæography of the tablet; (3) the philology of its text. A dispassionate examination of these three classes of evidence shows that no one of them will bear out the inference put upon it.

1. Hilprecht says on page 1 of this Deluge publication (i.e. *Bab. Exp. of the University of Pennsylvania*, ser. D, vol. v. Faciculus 1.), that the tablet was found 'while unpacking and examining two boxes of cuneiform tablets from our fourth expedition to Nippur.' On page 36 of the same publication he says: 'It was found intermingled with the dated and undated tablets of the lowest of the three strata of "Tablet Hill."'

Now the tablet was clearly found before Hilprecht himself reached Nippur, for he had not seen it until October of the present year. Indeed, in a footnote on page 1 he excuses himself for having overlooked it in Constantinople in 1901. But the important point is, that in *B.E.*, ser. D, vol. i. p. 509, Professor Hilprecht has himself said some interesting things about the methods of work followed by the fourth expedition before his arrival. He says: 'Our knowledge as to how and precisely where the tablets were found is extremely limited. As I must depend exclusively on Haynes's official entries and records for this important question, I deem it necessary to submit a specimen of my only written source of information for the time prior to my arrival, when most of the tablets were taken out of the ground. I quote literally from his diary: "January 16, 1900; 30 sound tablets from a low level in Tablet Hill." To this statement Hilprecht adds a footnote which reads: "I cannot even find out in which section of the large mound he unearthed these particular tablets. Nor is the slightest indication given by him as to whether he worked in a room, or found the tablets loose in the earth, or in both." To continue his quotations of Haynes's diary: 'Many large fine fragments of tablets, one pentagonal prism,  $7\frac{3}{4}$  inches long; its five sides from  $1-2\frac{1}{8}$  inches wide.' Three or four other quotations from Dr. Haynes's diary follow, all of the same import. The only definite statement is that the tablets were found at

a 'low level' in 'Tablet Hill.' This 'low level' in 'Tablet Hill' is where Dr. Haynes says all his tablets were found.

Again, in the book on the *So-Called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy*, p. 196, he declares that Dr. Haynes put tablets into boxes as he took them out of the ground, numbering the boxes 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., and that the only way he (Hilprecht) could tell from what part of the mounds they came was that the diaries stated in what part of the mound Haynes was digging at certain dates. Hilprecht adds: 'It would have been useful for me if the marking had been such as would indicate also the height of the stratum and the exact position; but Dr. Haynes could not do it, since he was alone in the field, and Mrs. Haynes never attempted to do it; consequently I must now infer . . . by other means to which stratum the tablets belong.'

If we turn now to p. 132 of the same book, we find that Hilprecht has there published the testimony of Mrs. Haynes, who was present when the so-called library was discovered. Her testimony shows that the general level at which tablets were found was known, but that the tablets were not found in strata at all. They were found, Mrs. Haynes says, in different rooms, dumped in such great heaps in the middle that the men could separate them only with the greatest difficulty, and that these heaps appeared as though the tablets had been thrown from shelves at the sides of the room. Imagine a library of account books thrown into the middle of the room from the shelves. Would there be *strata* in it? If the books had been arranged chronologically on the walls, would they be chronological in the heap on the floor?

It is thoroughly established, therefore, from Hilprecht's previous publications, that no such scientific records were kept on the fourth expedition at Nippur that one can draw any conclusions from them as to the date of a tablet. We are accordingly entirely dependent for the date upon palæographical and philological data.

2. Turning now to the palæographical evidence, it should be noted that Professor Clay has published two volumes of Cassite tablets from Nippur, and Dr. Poebel has published a volume of temple archives from the same place, and several volumes of temple archives from Telloh from the time of the Second Dynasty of Ur have been published. In addition to these, the writer has in his possession the photograph of a tablet, said to be from

Nippur, which is now in the Semitic Museum of Harvard University, dated in the reign of Ellil-bâni, a king of the dynasty of Isin, who ruled just at the period when Hilprecht dates his Deluge tablet. The writer has prepared for publication in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* a comparative table of the signs from these five sources. Of the signs which occur on Hilprecht's Deluge tablet ten undergo no development between the time of the Second Dynasty of Ur and the Neo-Babylonian time, and so may be left out of consideration. Of the remaining twenty-seven signs, twenty-one agree with Cassite forms as distinguished from the forms of the First Dynasty, or of Ellil-bâni, or of the kings of Ur. Four of the remaining signs are the same in the First Dynasty, in Hilprecht's tablet, and in the Cassite tablets. One sign agrees with a First Dynasty form, differing from the Cassite on the one hand, and from Ellil-bâni on the other, and one sign differs from the Cassite, agreeing with First Dynasty forms and the form on Ellil-bâni's tablet.

The verdict of palæography is, accordingly, 25 to 2 in favour of a Cassite date. It is 21 to 6 against a date as early as the First Dynasty of Babylon, and it renders the consideration of any earlier date unthinkable.

When we remember, too, that the above comparison is based on temple archives, and that such archives are always in the third millennium written in a less archaic script than the literary tablets of the time, the verdict of palæography is overwhelmingly in favour of a Cassite date for the Deluge fragment.

3. As philological evidence of a date prior to 2000 B.C., Hilprecht claims the use of *m* as a mimmation, the use of PI as *wa*, and the representation of *sh*, when occurring after a dental, by *z*. With reference to the mimmation, it occurs only in the two words *širim* and *napishtim*. As these words were still written in this form in the time of Assurbanipal, the occurrence of the mimmation in the Deluge fragment amounts to nothing.

Hilprecht declares in a recent newspaper article that PI with the value 'wa' is unknown in the Cassite period, and that it does not have the value 'wa' in the name Ni-im-mu-'wa-ri-ya in the El-Amarna letters.

With reference to PI used as 'wa' three remarks should be made :

(1) PI is used in inscriptions of the First Dynasty (2000-1800 B.C.) both for 'wa' and 'we.' Thus in the laws of Hammurabi we have 'a-PI-tum' for 'a-wa-tum' and 'a-PI-lu-tum' for 'a-we-lu-tum.' The two usages occur side by side. We also find both in the Cassite period (1750-1100 B.C.). Kadashman-Elil, in the El-Amarna letters, writes the name of Amenophis III. of Egypt 'Ni-mu-PI-ri-ya' for 'Ni-mu-'wa-ri-ya' and 'Ni-mu-PI-ri-ya' for 'Ni-mu-'wa-ri-ya' (see Abel and Winckler, *Thontafelfund von Tell-El-Amarna*, No. 1:1; 2:1).

In the name 'Ni-mu-'wa-ri-ya' the consonant 'w' occurs after the vowel 'u' and before 'a' would certainly be pronounced 'wa.' The letter 'w' slipped in between the vowels 'u,' and 'a' in Semitic to aid the pronunciation (see Brockelmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen*, S. 49, h.e.).

The fact that the name is Egyptian and not Babylonian is no proof that in the form of it written in Babylonia the ordinary phonetic laws did not apply. The hieroglyphic Egyptian does not express the vowels. 'Ni-im-mu-'wa-ri-ya' and 'Ni-im-mu-'wa-ri-ya' are attempts to represent the Egyptian 'Nb-m'-'t-re,' the Egyptian vowels being unknown to us. In the Babylonian form 'b' is assimilated to the following 'm,' 't' is elided and the vowel 'a' follows 'u.' It would be necessary among a Semitic people that between the 'u' and 'a' a 'w' should slip in to help the pronunciation. There is no more ground for doubting that 'PI' was pronounced 'wa' in this word because there was no 'w' in the Egyptian form of the word, than there is for supposing that 'ya' at the end of the word was not pronounced 'ya' because the Egyptian does not contain either letter of that syllable.<sup>1</sup>

In *Babylonian Expedition*, xiv. No. 58, 1 (a tablet of the Cassite period), we also find a-PI-lu-tum for a-we-lu-tum. The same usages are also found in copies of the Greek period (170-85 B.C.). In Reisner's *Sumerischbabylonisch Hymnen*, No. 55, 69, we have a-PI-tim for a-wa-tim, and in No. 2 rev. 27 a-PI-lu-tu for a-we-lu-tu. It is clear, then, that where we find one usage we find the other.

(2) The evidence just adduced shows that PI = wa

<sup>1</sup> The fact that in the *Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum*, No. 1, l. 2, the name is spelled Ni-ib-bu-a-ri-a in no way affects the above argument, as that letter was written in Egypt, and does not reflect the Babylonian pronunciation.

is not a mark even of a First Dynasty date, to say nothing of a date in the time of the Isin dynasty, for it is found in the Cassite period and even in the Greek period, down to the first century B.C.

(3) PI is defined in II. R, 39, No. 2, 14, as 'a,' where it is used in writing the word a-šu-u--the very word under discussion in Hilprecht's tablet. In I. R, 52, No. 4, 3, PI-aš-ru stands for a-aš-ru. (Cf. Ball, *P.S.B.A.*, x. 290). Here PI must equal 'a,' for the root begins with 'y.' In the word ti-PI-mat (H. 5298, cf. *A.L.<sup>3</sup>*, p. 26, n. 1), PI might stand either for 'wa' or 'a.' In the Neo-Babylonian period it was used at Nippur, from which Hilprecht says his Deluge tablet came, at the beginning of several words. Thus Nebuchadnezzar, *B.E.*, I. No. 85, i. 10, uses PI-ash-rat for a-ash-rat; Nabu-na'id, *B.E.*, I. No. 84, i. 6, has PI-shi-ib for a-shi-ib; in i. 15, PI-ash-ru-um for a-ash-ru-um; in ii. 33, PI-ar-ka-at for wa-ar-ka-at or a-ar-ka-at; in ii. 45, PI-ash-ri-im for a-ash-ri-im; and in ii. 52, lu-u-PI-aš-ši-im for lu-u-wa-aš-ši-im or lu-u-a-aš-ši-im. It is not certain that any of these were pronounced 'wa,' but when the sign was part of a root beginning with 'w' it may still have had the value 'wa.' That, however, we cannot confidently affirm, for already in the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon we find wa-ar-ḥu-um, 'month' (King's *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, No. 14, 5), by the side of arḥu (No. 27, 10); cf. also *Laws of Hammurabi*, xxxix. 11, 15, and xliii. 52, and Brockelmann's *Vergleichende Grammatik der Semitschen Sprachen*, § 49, h.a. Apparently initial 'w' had begun to disappear in First Dynasty period. There is some uncertainty about the matter, as the word which scholars transliterate 'arḥu' is written ideographically, but that it should be transliterated without the initial 'w' is the opinion of Scheil (*Délégation en Perse*, vol. iv. pp. 114, 127), of R. F. Harper (*Code of Hammurabi*, pp. 92, 106, and 155); L. W. King, *op. cit.* iii. 267, and Brockelmann as cited above.

As a result of observing these facts, we may affirm that the one occurrence of PI=wa in Hilprecht's tablet (occurring in wa-ši-e) does not prove that the tablet is earlier than the Cassite period, and that it may be that we should read a-si-e, in which case we have a purely Neo-Babylonian form, which is not a mark even for a Cassite date. It is upon this syllable that Professor Hilprecht relies for one-fourth of his philological proof that the tablet is earlier than 2000 B.C. One point more must be touched upon.

Professor Hilprecht declares that 'sh after dentals or sibilants regularly becomes s (in old Babylonian z). This peculiar change of sh to z is never found in the inscriptions of the Cassite period.' In reply, it may be said that it occurs in the following instances in Cassite texts published in the series edited by Hilprecht himself. In *B.E.*, xv. 149, 38, Belit-shu-nu, which according to rule becomes Belit-su-nu, is written Belit-zu-nu. The same name, having, according to another well-known phonetic law, undergone a further change by losing the t, is written in *B.E.*, xv. 188, iv. 20 (Be)-li-zu-nu. The first part of the name, though broken, is vouched for by No. 195 rev. 26, where it is spelled Beli-su-nu. Again, Ellil-uballit-shu, which by regular rule becomes Ellil-uballit-su, is spelled in *B.E.*, xiv. 33, 9, Ellil-uballit-zu. The change of sh to z is accordingly by no means unknown in the Cassite period.

The result of our discussion is in brief this. We have no archæological information from which a date can be affirmed. The palæography points conclusively to a date in the Cassite period. There is nothing in the philology of the tablet that is inconsistent with this. A scientific investigation of the tablet points conclusively, therefore, to a date in the Cassite period. Père Scheil's fragment, dated in the reign of a First Dynasty king, is accordingly some centuries older.

## Literature.

### THE SELF-REVELATION OF OUR LORD.

THE Rev. J. C. V. Durell, B.D., formerly Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, recently published a volume entitled *The Historic Church*, which enabled men to recognize a new writer of promise. He has now published a volume with the title of *The Self-Revelation of our Lord* (T. & T. Clark; 5s. net). Its subject is the deepest and most difficult that any man could undertake to write upon. But along with the gift of style Mr. Durell has evidently the gift of insight. He is also most refreshingly honest. This new book will give him a place among the most acceptable writers on religion of the day.

We say Mr. Durell is honest. The problems that present themselves to a writer on our Lord's revelation of Himself include all the ordinary problems of the Gospels, together with many special problems of both theology and psychology. The temptation to a believer is to spend ingenuity in harmonizing instead of giving his strength to history. Mr. Durell has not done this. In dealing with the narrative of the conversation of Jesus with the woman of Samaria, he comes to the very difficult circumstance that so early in the ministry Jesus is represented by St. John as directly declaring Himself to be the Messiah. This declaration, Mr. Durell admits, 'runs counter to all that we have learnt from the Synoptic narrative.' He points out that the Synoptic narrative is concerned for the most part with the ministry in Galilee, 'and it is just possible that considerations which would be of force among a Galilæan or Judæan audience would not have the same force in Samaria.' At the same time he finds it difficult to suppose that Jesus would have departed so far from His constant policy at this early period of His ministry even in Samaria, as to declare Himself openly to be the Christ. The simplest explanation, he thinks, is that St. John, who was presumably not present at the interview, has reconstructed the incident from information with which Jesus may have supplied him, and that he has by this means given a literary shape to the conversation with the woman.

Such a theory will be distasteful to some of us.

But it is better to be so disturbed than to be flattered by arguments which try to prove that there is no difficulty in the narrative. And it must be said that Mr. Durell does very much more to confirm belief in the reliability of the gospel narratives than to disturb it. His method is historical. He traces our Lord's revelation of Himself first from the beginning of the ministry to St. Peter's confession, next from St. Peter's confession to the crucifixion. And this historical method of handling his great theme makes it a most irresistible argument on behalf of the reliability of the sources as well as the truthfulness of the theme itself.

The personality of our Lord is the subject of keenest interest at the present moment. No progress can be made in the study of it without an accurate knowledge of the materials contained in the New Testament. There is no book we have seen which sets forth the New Testament doctrine more candidly or more convincingly than this book.

### THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD.

The Bampton Lecturer for 1909 was the Rev. Walter Hobbouse, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of Birmingham Cathedral, and formerly Fellow of Hertford College, Oxford. His lectures have now been published under the title of *The Church and the World in Idea and in History* (Macmillan; 10s. net). The volume contains, not only the lectures as delivered, but also a series of footnotes, and an important appendix of additional notes, some of which must have cost the author a good deal of research. Perhaps the note on the use of the term 'Erastianism' might be selected as an example.

What is the subject of the Bampton Lectures for 1909? It is the purpose of Christ in relation to the world. Canon Hobbouse holds that our Lord intended to make a distinction between the world and the Church, a distinction the most emphatic, and one that was meant to last. The Church was to be in the world, but not of it. And this distinction held good throughout the first three centuries. It began to be obliterated when Christianity became the religion of the

empire. The Bampton lecturer's desire is to recover that distinction, and to insist upon its being observed in the future.

Now there is only one way of recovering that distinction. Those who have not the mind of Christ must be weeded out of the Church and left with the world. How shall we know whether or not a man has the mind of Christ? Canon Hobhouse says very little about that. And he is right to say very little. For we do know. The serious difficulty is not how to distinguish those who belong to the Kingdom from those who belong to the world, but how to keep those who manifestly belong to the world from entering into connexion with the Church.

Some will say that we have no right to interfere with them. They will refer to the Parable of the Tares. They will quote the words of our Lord, 'Let both grow together until the harvest.' Canon Hobhouse explains the Parable of the Tares. He points out that the 'field' where both are allowed to grow together is not the Church, but the world. He argues earnestly that our right to weed the Church of any tares that may sow themselves in it is the unmistakable precept and example of our Lord.

Nevertheless the difficulty is very great. But there are some things which can be done if we have the courage to do them. In the first place, he says, we must work in the direction of re-union. We must seek to unite all the Christian bodies that are Christian. In the next place, we shall probably have to separate the Church from the State. And then, perhaps, we must give up the idea that the kingdoms of this world are all and altogether to become the Kingdom of our God and of His Christ. These are great tasks, and the last is the hardest of all. But the necessity is great. The Missionary Conference in Edinburgh took place after the publication of Canon Hobhouse's Bampton Lectures, and it must have seemed as if every speaker had read the book and recognized the importance of it. For every speaker emphasized this one thing, that the hindrance to the progress of the gospel was the fact that the Christian nations were not Christian. The great evangelist is the personal example of the Christian missionary, but if the example of the missionary is neutralized by the example of the Christian trader the progress of the gospel is stayed.

---

There is nothing so puzzling to the rationalist as the interest which men continue to feel in the Atonement. In spite of all his superior impatience, the Atonement is more the subject of study now than ever it was, and more is written upon it than ever was written before. The latest book is a systematic exposition of the doctrine by the Rev. Melville Scott, B.D., Vicar of Castlechurch, Stafford. Its title is simply *The Atonement* (George Allen & Sons; 5s. net). Mr. Scott has no new theory of the Atonement to offer. His book will not mark an epoch, or even start a discussion. But his survey of the subject is a thoroughly competent one. And if he emphasizes, and perhaps over-emphasizes, the ethical side, that will make his book only the more acceptable to the modern mind.

---

The Rev. John Thomas, M.A., of Liverpool, is undoubtedly one of the greatest preachers of our time. His new volume, *The Dynamic of the Cross* (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net), is not his greatest volume of sermons. We place before it the volume on the Apocalypse; for he seems to rise to his highest height when he has a continued subject. But it is a great volume. We should just like to know where the doctrine of the Cross will be found expressed with more brevity, simplicity, power, than in the sermon on 'The Sin-bearing Lamb of God.'

---

Mr. Allenson's 'Sanctuary Booklets' (6d. net) consist of *The Practice of the Presence of God* by Brother Lawrence, *The Dream of Gerontius* by Newman, *Saint Paul* by Myers, and *The Changed Cross*, a collection of poems, by the Hon. Mrs. Hobart Hampden.

But Mr. Allenson has another series of devotion besides this, a series issued in leather at 2s. 6d. net, to which he has just added *The Little Flowers of St. Francis*.

---

Messrs. George Bell & Sons have published a revised text, with introduction and commentary, of *The Elegies of Theognis* (7s. 6d. net). The editor, Mr. T. Hudson-Williams, M.A., Professor of Greek in the University College of North Wales, is a most accomplished and indefatigable scholar.

---

The editor of the new volume of the 'Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges' is the Rev. A. Lukyn Williams, B.D., Vicar of Guilden

Morden. The book is the *Epistle to the Galatians* (Cambridge Press). The introduction is a long one and well packed. The first question to be asked is: Who were the Galatians according to this editor? After a thorough examination of the evidence, Mr. Lukyn Williams comes to the conclusion that they lived in North Galatia. Then he places the Epistle chronologically between 2 Corinthians and Romans. So this subject is all to be opened up again. But there could not be a fairer critic than this or a more informing commentator.

Messrs. Wells Gardner have published a small volume of sermons by the Bishop of London, entitled *The Mysteries of God* (1s. net).

In issuing a new book by Ella Wheeler Wilcox, her publishers have done a very clever thing in issuing along with it a selection of her poems, making a presentation of the booklet containing them. The new book is entitled *New Thought Common Sense, and What Life Means to Me* (Gay & Hancock; 4s. 6d. net). Its chapters are the High Calling of Fatherhood, Common-Sense Ideas in Marriage, Woman and the Cigarette, Sinning against the Holy Ghost, and the like—or the unlike. But whatever the chapter may be called, it is a chapter worth reading and very pleasant to read. For Ella Wheeler Wilcox is a prose writer as well as a poet. She has the intimate style, which, when not overdone, is the most enjoyable of all. Nevertheless, take for preference one of the poems in the book. For there are poems in the book as well as in the booklet.

I know not where to-morrow's paths may wend,  
Nor what the future holds; but this I know:  
Whichever way my feet are forced to go,  
I shall be given courage to the end.

Though God that awful gift of His may send  
We call long life, where headstones in a row  
Hide all of happiness, yet be it so:  
I shall be given courage to the end.

If dark the deepening shadows be, that blend  
With life's pale sunlight when the sun dips low,  
Though Joy speeds by and Sorrow's steps are slow,  
I shall be given courage to the end.

I do not question what the years portend—  
Or good or ill, whatever wind may blow;  
It is enough, enough for me to know  
I shall be given courage to the end.

Messrs. Watts have added to their 'History of Science' series a *History of Old Testament Criticism*, by Professor Archibald Duff (1s. net). It is a handy book for popular use, and will be more popular because of the portraits it contains.

We envy those who have the privilege of listening to the Rev. A. L. Lilley. We envy those who have the power. For there is never a commonplace thought to go to sleep upon; and sometimes the thought is very subtle. But, again, there is never a thought that is there for the sake of its subtlety. Mr. Lilley is a genuine expositor. It is only that he explains the Scripture for himself. And his loyalty to the Lord is exquisite. That species of originality which pleasantly pats the Master with a long forefinger is far removed from him. Mr. Lilley has published many volumes of sermons, and you ought to know him now. But if you do not know him, take the latest, *The Religion of Life* (Griffiths; 3s. 6d. net), before the others.

The Rev. W. J. Heaton, B.D., recently wrote a volume on *The English Bible before the Age of Printing*. He has now written a sequel to that volume, calling it *The Bible of the Reformation* (Griffiths; 5s. net). It brings the story of the Bible in English a little beyond the time of Taverner. No doubt there will be a third volume to bring the story down to Kenyon's great article in the single-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*.

Mr. T. Sharper Knowlson has been a diligent student of Brand's *Popular Antiquities*. And if his book on *The Origins of Popular Superstitions and Customs* (Werner Laurie; 6s. net) does nothing more than send us to Brand, it will do us a distinct service. But it will do more. For Mr. Knowlson has studied other books besides Brand, and he has himself done some research work in popular antiquities. One thing he has made clear enough—that there is much more meaning in these ancient superstitions than this present prosaic generation dreams of. If we had room we should like to dispute some of his derivations, such as that of the 'kern-baby.' He discards 'churn,' although it is known that the 'churn' or 'kirm' had an important place in the harvest supper. And he takes the word to be a corruption of corn.

Dr. E. Lehmann, Professor of Divinity in the

University of Berlin, has written a manual of Mysticism, which has been translated into English. The title is *Mysticism in Heathendom and Christendom* (Luzac; 5s. net). It is just such a manual, covering the whole ground and written by a competent authority, as the numerous would-be students of mysticism will welcome. It is divided into chapters on Primitive Mysticism, Chinese Mysticism, Indian Mysticism, and so on. Each chapter will afterwards have to be studied by itself, and it would have been an advantage for that purpose if Dr. Lehmann had added a bibliography.

How good it must be for a man to spend a year of his life in a hard study of *The Ethics of St. Paul*. We mean the book which bears that name. A study of the ethics as it may be gathered from the Epistles themselves would no doubt always be better. But the Rev. A. B. D. Alexander is so loyal to the Apostle, so thorough in his research, so captivating in the way he commends, not one virtue only but the virtuous life, that the study of such a book as this would remain with one an imperishable possession (Maclehose; 6s. net).

The article on 'Charity and Charities' in what is called the tenth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* was written by Dr. C. S. Loch. The article has now been reprinted, and along with other matter forms a volume published by Messrs. Macmillan under the title of *Charity and Social Life* (6s. net). The additional matter is mainly religious—charity in relation to the growth of religious thought. But there is also a new chapter, and a long one, dealing with some of the questions raised by the report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Relief of Distress. Dr. Loch's experience as a director of the administration of charity is unrivalled, whether in variety or in extent; and although he knows the history of its administration also, we should certainly have preferred that he had given us somewhat less of the history of the past and more of the record of his own personal experience. We are in so great a hurry now to mend our manners in the matter of giving that we grudge the time spent among the Greeks and the Romans. And so, much as we approve in general of the historical study of a subject, we have little hesitation in saying that the new chapter on the Report of the Commission is worth all the rest of the book taken together.

A third edition has been issued of Professor Joseph B. Mayor's *Epistle of St. James* (Macmillan; 14s. net). It is thirteen years since the second edition was published, and in that time there has been much study of Apostolic Christianity, and some important discoveries have been made. The consequence is that Professor Mayor, who misses neither book nor magazine article, has worked over the whole commentary again, and made innumerable alterations. In none of these alterations has he had to confess serious error or fundamental change of view. They are nearly all made in the way of establishment and confirmation. Yet they alter the complexion and to some extent the bulk of the new edition. Thus the note on 'shadow of turning' of 1<sup>17</sup> (τροπής ἀποσκίασμα) ended in the second edition with the words: 'Spitta takes τροπή of the sun's invisible return from west to east, and ἀποσκίασμα of the darkness of night.' In the third edition the same note ends: 'I cannot agree with Spitta, who takes τροπή of the sun's invisible return from west to east, and ἀποσκίασμα of the darkness of night. This verse forms the key-note of the Celestial Hierarchy of Dionysius.' The greatest change in the size of the book occurs in the Introduction, which now runs to 290 pages against 260 in the second edition. This is due almost entirely to an enlargement of the chapter on the Brethren of our Lord. Again Professor Mayor has not altered his attitude one whit. He still holds that James was son of Joseph and Mary, and full brother of Jesus. But he strengthens his proof by some new arguments and many new quotations. The literature is brought up to date, and it is so full that we wonder Dr. Mayor has omitted Mr. James Adderley's Commentary and the suggestive book by Dr. C. F. Deems of New York, which goes by the title of *The Gospel of Common Sense*. Among the Dictionaries, however, the single-volume *Dictionary of the Bible* should certainly have been mentioned, with its excellent article on the 'Epistle of James' by Mr. Emmet.

Professor Shailer Mathews is a mediator. He stands between the advanced critic of the Gospels and the disturbed follower of the Lord Jesus Christ. He knows the advanced critic and all his works so well that he is not himself at all disturbed. He is not afraid to reprove him. He is not afraid to laugh at him. And then he has immense sympathy with the uneasy believer. He

reproves him also, but he never laughs at him. He stands between those two, accepting just as much as is worth accepting from the advanced critic, and removing just as much as is not worth retaining from the timorous follower.

His new book is entitled *The Gospel and the Modern Man* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net).

There is nothing unfathomably profound, perhaps, in *Absente Reo* (Macmillan; 5s. net), the new book by the author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*, but there is abundance that is present-day and practical. The book is a collection of 'open' letters written to a High Churchman, and its range of topic is as wide as the interests of a Churchman are ever likely to be. But whatever the topic, the object of the writer seems to be to get the High Churchman to do something. He thinks he is too conservative, too much addicted to conserving whether the thing is worth conserving or not. He looks at Lazarus out of the windows of Dives, instead of looking at Dives from the side of Lazarus. He is alarmed at those people who are trying to turn the world upside down, when he ought himself to be doing all he can to that very end. 'These people that have turned the world upside down are come hither also.' That, says our author, is the Churchman's pathetic plaint, in his forgetfulness that that was said at first of Christians by pagans, and must be said of Christians as long as there are pagans to say it.

It is of no use for any man to write on prayer who has not discovered that things are wrought by prayer. The Rev. W. Arthur Cornaby of Shanghai has had a larger experience of the power of prayer than the average earnest believer in it. It is solely out of his own experience that he writes the book entitled *Let us Pray* (Marshall Brothers). The instances are unimpeachable, and they are both numerous and striking.

Those square little volumes which form the 'Life of Faith' library, with their curious old-world courtesy of binding, are able to introduce us to a real fireside of love. The new volumes are *God's Adversary and Ours*, by the Rev. L. G. Buchanan, M.A., T.C.D., and *Promise and Prophecy*, by Mr. G. W. West (Marshall Brothers; 1s. net each).

*The Captivity and the Pastoral Epistles* will be found in one volume in the 'Westminster New Testament' (Melrose; 2s. net). The author of the volume is the Rev. James Strachan, M.A., whose volume entitled *Hebrew Ideals* has made his name known far and wide. We congratulate Dr. Garvie, the general editor of the series. Mr. Strachan's work is at once the finest scholarship, and the ripest fruit of spiritual experience. The originality of it is a steady surprise. There is little room for historical or biographical illustration; but where it is found it is worth its place. Take Ephesians 2<sup>11</sup>—'*Remember that aforetime*: This, says Mr. Strachan, is not inconsistent with the advice to forget the things which are behind (Phil 3<sup>13</sup>). If you are thinking of the past complacently, forget it; if humbly and thankfully, cherish the memory (cf. Is 51<sup>1</sup>). "I often take a dander up and down my unregenerate days," said a Scottish saint.'

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have undertaken the issue of a series of volumes which is to be known by the name of the 'Missionary Series.' The editor is George Smith, C.I.E., LL.D., F.R.G.S., F.S.S., whom some may prefer to think of as the father of Principal George Adam Smith, but who has himself a reputation that is enviable, especially as a writer of books on India and its Missions.

Four volumes of the series have been issued at once. They are these:—

1. *Christ the Desire of Nations*, by the Rev. Edgar William Davis (6s.).
2. *The Victory of the Gospel*, by the Rev. J. P. Lilley, D.D. (6s.).
3. *The Call of the New Era*, by the Rev. William Muir, M.A., B.D., B.L. (6s.).
4. *By Temple Shrine and Lotus Pool*, by the Rev. William Robinson (6s.).

Some of these volumes catch our interest before we open them. We are told that out of over a hundred missionary works, two of them were selected for a prize of 100 guineas in open competition. As soon as we open them we are face to face with Dr. George Smith's generous, glowing appreciation. But before we close them, we recognize that the appreciation is not overdone. Evidently the offer of a handsome prize is a good way of discovering talent in some departments of literature. If these volumes were selected as the best out of 'over a hundred,' we are forced to

consider how hard it must have been on the examiners to reject the next four. The men who have written these books have given their lives to the study of the missionary problem, some of them also to the practice of it. They have not taken it up as a good topic for a new book; they have not got up the subject for the sake of winning a prize. They are acquainted with the literature of missions; they are in close sympathetic touch with the life of the missionaries. And the examiners have manifestly made it a test of success that the author should be able to write good English.

Two of the authors, Dr. Lilley and Mr. Muir, are United Free Churchmen; Mr. Davis is an American; Mr. Robinson has sent his manuscript from Salem in the south of India. Mr. Robinson's is the only volume with local colour. But it agrees with the rest in dealing with the fundamental principles of missionary effort rather than with their particular application. Of all the volumes it must be said that their subject is Christ quite as much as the Kingdom of God. Or it is the Kingdom of God in Christ's idea and purpose rather than a description of any particular attempt to realize that purpose.

But there is an order among them. Mr. Davis deals with the promise and its earliest apprehension. Dr. Lilley recognizes its universality and the un-failing victory it gives to faithfulness. Mr. Robinson brings it into contact with the actual conditions of our day. Mr. Muir seeks to prepare us for the miracles which are to be done in the years which lie before us.

The latest of Mr. Murray's primers is *A Primer of Ethics* (1s.). The author is Miss E. E. Constance Jones, Mistress of Girton College, Cambridge. It is a marvellous *multum in parvo*. Every chapter of it could be stretched into a volume, every sentence into a chapter. And yet there is neither haste nor obscurity.

The idea of a 'Children's Missionary Series' was a happy one, and it has been just as happily realized. The new volumes give us the *Children of Arabia*, by Dr. J. C. Young of Aden, and the *Children of Africa*, by Mr. J. B. Baird (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 1s. 6d. net). The story is in each case simply and truthfully told. The coloured illustrations catch the eye and keep it.

We shall not suggest of Dr. Butler of Galeshiels that architecture is his forte and preaching his foible. But it is evident from the volume on *Gothic Architecture: Its Christian Origin and Inspiration*, which he has just published (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net), that the study of architecture is with him more than an amusement. He studies it with a purpose. He is a preacher already. He studies architecture to make him more a preacher. It may not be, because of the lack of materials to work upon, that architecture will ever become a popular topic with a Bible Class in Scotland. But if any teacher is gruelled for a subject and comes across this book, we shall be greatly astonished if he does not discover one.

There are books which have no index at all. The commentary on *The Gospel according to Saint Luke*, by the Rev. A. S. Walpole, M.A., has an index, and it is the best part of the volume. The commentary itself is extremely brief, the explanation of a word or phrase here and there throughout the narrative. But if Oxford means seriously to challenge the supremacy of Cambridge in small commentaries, a better way could not have been found than the utmost brevity of commentary and the utmost expansion of index, such as we find here. The index is a small dictionary of the Third Gospel (1s. 6d.).

How difficult it seems to be to pray in print. Mr. Victor Rienaeker has published *A Book of Prayers* (Priory Press; 2s. 6d. net). It is simply another illustration of the difficulty. Thus—'This preparedness can, and does, consist with a comparatively small intellectual endowment. The spiritual plane is different from the intellectual, or physical, though it may, and must, govern and fructify them, also. And we ask that Thou would'st go far beyond where our poor limited knowledge goes, or our poor puny power could go, and do what we fain would do when we pray in the spirit of Christ.'

But from the Priory Press there comes another book, a book which may be read without reserve. It is *The Church and the Future*, by the late Father Tyrrell (2s. 6d. net), in a new impression.

It takes a strong man or a confident one to publish a volume now on *The Lord's Prayer*

(Revell; 2s. 6d. net). Dr. Charles F. Aked is both. The balanced student of theology is bound to feel that he puts too much weight on the mere revelation of the Fatherhood. The student of literature is bound to feel that he errs in taste when he quotes the most terrible verse from Burns' 'Address to the Deil.' But no one will question the clearness of the thinking or the vigour of its expression.

The Duff Lectures are delivered at the colleges of the United Free Church of Scotland. The lectures for 1910 were delivered by Dr. Robert E. Speer, Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Six lectures were delivered at each college, and the same six. The subject of the first was the Missionary Duty and Motives; of the second, the Missionary Aim and Methods; of the third, Missions and the Native Churches; of the fourth, Missions and Politics; of the fifth, Christianity and the Non-Christian Religions; of the sixth, the Relation of Missions to the Unity of the Church and the Unity of the World.

Here, then, is the whole theory of witness-bearing, by a man who has made it his lifelong and most devoted study. And it is set forth with unhesitating assurance. At the recent Conference in Edinburgh there was nothing more remarkable than the utter ignorance, on the part of the speakers, of the art of apologizing. For Dr. Speer was there, and he set the example. It is no longer a question of whether the gospel should be sent to the ends of the earth; the only question now is how best to send it. It is to answer that question that the Duff Lectures were delivered and that this book is published. Its title is *Christianity and the Nations* (Revell; 7s. 6d. net).

Essay writers have nearly always the idea that eternal life can be obtained by keeping the commandments. Or rather—for they are right enough in that—they have the idea that any likely young man can be induced to keep them. We do not grudge Dr. Vance's insistence upon right conduct in that new book which he calls *Tendency* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). We only wish that he and the rest of the numerous religious essayists of our day would put the 'follow me' first. The best of these books are always good for one thing; they furnish us with striking anecdotes and illustrations.

The Hon. Mrs. E. A. Gordon has not gone to the ordinary sources for her quotations in *Treasures of Darkness and Songs of Ascent* (Simpkin; 5s. net). The range is wide enough certainly—from the *Weekly Scotsman* to the *Pyramid of Pepi I*. But just because the range is so wide, the familiar quotations are passed by. Perhaps the most striking thing about the book is the frequency with which the Old and New Testaments are quoted. A text from St. Luke is read with new interest on a page which quotes also Dante, Sakya-Muni, and a Sumerian tablet.

Mgr. Duchesne's *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, has reached a third edition in English (S.P.C.K.; 10s.). It represents the fourth French edition, which was published at Paris in 1908. Or rather, it represents a fifth French edition not yet published. For to this English edition Mgr. Duchesne has added some notes which have not appeared in any French edition yet. The most important of these is an account of the discovery at Monte Cassino, by Dom André Wilmart, of fragments of an uncial manuscript which proves to be the earliest example known of a Gregorian Missal.

It is needless now to say anything by way of commendation of Duchesne's book, or of its translation, beyond what has been said already. It is not only necessary for its subject; it is all that is necessary.

After twelve years, Chancellor Lias's manual on *The Nicene Creed* appears in a second edition (Sonnenschein; 7s. 6d.). The second edition is 'reprinted in the main from the old stereotyped plates.' But there is a new preface, in which Mr. Lias replies to a review which appeared in 'a certain theological Quarterly,' and which tried to show that he was insufficiently equipped for the task which he had undertaken. He shows that he was quite well equipped.

*Outline Studies, with Illustrations for Sermons and Addresses* (Stock; 2s. 6d. net). This is a volume which has been compiled by the Rev. James Dinwoodie. It will soon be laid on the shelf and gather the thickest coat of dust. For that is the fate of even the best volumes of illustrations. But before suffering that eclipse it will provide the best thing in some men's sermons. For some

of its illustrations are quite new and quite illustrative.

The third series of the Moorhouse Lectures, the series for 1910, was delivered by the Bishop of Ballarat, Dr. Arthur Vincent Green. The subject of the Lectures was 'The Johannine Writings.' But Dr. Green does not use the word Johannine in the title of the book containing them. For he does not believe that any of the writings which usually go by the name of the Apostle John were written by him. He believes that they are the product of a school of writers whose centre of abode was Ephesus, and who probably looked to the Apostle John as their founder. He accordingly calls his book *The Ephesian Canonical Writings* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). The whole book is a plea for suspense of judgment. Here are two characteristic sentences. 'Admitting that the evidence for St. John's direct authorship is better in the case of the Apocalypse than in that of any other writing in the New Testament, we must still exercise some patience of the agnostic position. If any man is persuaded that here at least he has the very sentences of John the Apostle, let his persuasion be tempered by charitable recognition of the many

inevitable uncertainties which encompass this much debated question.'

*The Life of Christ*, Part II., by the Rev. W. M. Rankin, B.D., Glasgow (Publications Office of the U.F. Church of Scotland; price 6d.). Mr. Stevens' excellent primer (Part I.) on the Life of Christ has been followed by one equally admirable from the pen of Mr. Rankin, who has also, we believe, undertaken the third and final instalment of the series. The little work before us, which covers the period of our Lord's ministry extending from the Rejection at Nazareth to the Anointing at Bethany, bears traces of the widest reading and most careful study of the subject. It is written in a clear and interesting style, and the material is skilfully adapted to the various ages of the young people for whom the textbook is intended. The illustrative comments and the literary parallels are well chosen, and the whole work may be confidently recommended, especially for the use of Bible classes. In his Preface the author acknowledges indebtedness to Professor Denney for help in planning the book, and to Dr. Selbie for revision of the proofs.

## The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

BY PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

### PART V.

VII. Some may object to our view that the Rite in the early Church exercised a strong influence on the historians, and may support their objection by pointing to the variations in the accounts given by those historians. This argument ignores human character. Take any dozen people, however similar in education and previous circumstances they may be, and get them each to give an account of some scene at which they have been all present. You will find that they give twelve different accounts, varying slightly in details and in manner of stating the same detail; yet all twelve will be easily recognizable as accounts of the same scene by eye-witnesses.

We therefore presuppose as our starting-point the strong guiding force exerted on every narrator

by the familiar Rite. This we regard as fundamental in the right understanding of the authorities. The Rite must have been by Luke regarded as performed regularly from the earliest time, and as being therefore unquestionably authoritative for the words and the actions of the original incident. All this is perfectly natural. In Ac 2<sup>42</sup> the Breaking of the Bread<sup>1</sup> is certainly the Sacrament, which already was the symbol and pledge of the unity of the Christian society from the day when

<sup>1</sup> In 2<sup>46</sup>, 'breaking bread' is an act of ordinary life, which may and probably was accompanied by the rite, but is not mentioned with reference to the rite. In 20<sup>7</sup> the Christians at Troas assembled for the common meal (which was doubtless accompanied by the Sacrament, though no formal mention is made of this).

it constituted itself as a united body on the first Pentecost. Even in the lifetime of Jesus the act was felt to have some special and peculiar significance (Mk 6<sup>41</sup> 8<sup>6</sup>, Mt 14<sup>19</sup> 14<sup>36</sup>, Lk 9<sup>16</sup>, Jn 6<sup>11.23</sup>), and He was recognized by His disciples at Emmaus after His death 'in the breaking of the bread' (Lk 24<sup>35</sup>). Such recognition was obviously not due to one performance of the action; especially as there is clear reason to think that the two at Emmaus were not Apostles.

This act was therefore not connected by the early Church merely with the last occasion on which it was performed by the Saviour before His death. The act was characteristic of Him during His life, and remembered as performed by Him on various occasions at the giving of food by Him to His friends and followers. The most impressive by far of those occasions was that which occurred on the night before He was betrayed; this, however, was only one among many occasions; but it was marked out from the rest by the words of Institution, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'

There is no reason to think that the Sacrament was at first preserved as an annual or weekly or monthly celebration. It was performed frequently, and apparently was regarded as being suitable on all occasions when a number of the Brethren were assembled to eat together, or when any incident or occasion occurred of bread being eaten in very impressive circumstances.<sup>1</sup>

It was not a periodic rite, but almost a continuous one, as the expression of the belief in the continuous presence of Christ among them. Perhaps we might gather from the emphasis laid on it in Ac 2<sup>42</sup>, that it was not performed after Lk 24<sup>30</sup> (or after the Ascension) until the Brethren became aware at Pentecost of the continued presence of the Saviour with them. The Rite was the expression of the firm belief and knowledge that the Saviour was with them, and that the Bread and Wine were given by Him, and according to the Oriental mind were Himself. To the illogically logical and narrow European mind, which can rarely attain to the mystic perception of the truth, this belief and knowledge is often a cause of dissension on the question, whether the material

substances given in the Rite are only the symbols of the Divine presence, or are transformed into new and Divine substance—a barren and foolish dissension, between the champions of two empty theories, neither of which has any reality to the mind that looks at the subject from the right point of view: both are products of Western thought, and both are foreign to the Oriental thought. The Western mind, through its desire to give precision and definite form to the vague and mystic, is always prone to misrepresent and misconceive Oriental thought; and thus falls into the error of materializing the ideal and spiritual.

The Oriental view is best understood by the example of a child, which takes a few stones and says, 'This is a castle, and this is a knight riding to attack it,' and so on. The child does not regard the stones as being mere symbols of the castle and the knight, nor does it regard them as transmuted into the castle and the knight. To the child they are what the child makes them. As the child lives its ideal life, which we call 'play,' these material objects become part of its higher life, and are what the things of that life are. The idea is all-powerful: the material fact is of no consequence. The child is right, and the Oriental is right. The idea is the important thing: the material is nought. The doctrine of transubstantiation sinks from the plane of the spiritual and true to the commonest level of materialistic commonplace. It is wholly unspiritual, and supposes the reality to be in mere matter. The doctrine of symbolism is narrowly logical and wholly unmystical. The Sacrament is purely mystic.

VIII. The fact that the doctrine and principle of the Eucharist already existed in the teaching of Jesus at a much earlier time, and was expressed in His practice, does not necessarily throw any doubt on His formal institutions of the Sacrament on the night before His death. The testimony of Paul (1 Co 10. 11) is quite clear and definite on this point; and it may be regarded as final. There is no difficulty and no inconsistency in the two positions: Jesus taught the doctrine during His life (though, like much of His teaching, it was not understood by the disciples), and gave some marked significance to the act of breaking and distributing the Bread in His daily life; on the last night He enjoined on the Twelve to repeat the act in His memory. Both are true.

<sup>1</sup> Ac 27<sup>35</sup> is not strictly a case (though Blass regards it as being so), for the assembly was almost entirely of pagans; but probably Luke recognized it as being a Sacrament for Paul and for himself and Aristarchus (assuming that the latter was still with them).

It is not a case where we have to choose between one and the other.

One thing, however, follows inevitably from this previously existing germ of the Eucharist. That which was instituted was not a mere commemoration of the death of the Saviour; it had no analogy or connexion with a death-feast or a sepulchral feast, which was usually an annual one. It was the expression of a truth, of a vital principle, which had been part of the teaching of Jesus long before.

John thought that the earlier teaching of Jesus on this subject was even more important than the formal institution of the ceremony. While he devotes considerable space to recounting the events of the Supper on the Thursday night, he does not allude to the incident of the Bread and Wine. One must infer that he regarded this incident as not of absolutely vital consequence, and that he deliberately aimed at emphasizing the importance of the earlier teaching by omitting the final incident.

Now, considering the great part that the ceremony had played in the Church during the long period of somewhere near seventy years, which elapsed between the Crucifixion and the composition of the Fourth Gospel, we must attach great importance to John's omission of the incident while describing the Supper. In most cases it is unsafe and unjustifiable to lay much stress on, or draw serious inferences from, the silence of an historian about an incident which he omits amid the pressure of many events for attention; but this incident is exceptional; and one cannot see how it could be omitted except deliberately and of set purpose.

Moreover, the doctrine of the Eucharist is not omitted. It is stated elsewhere. The occasion on which John records the exposition of the mystic truth that is expressed in the Rite is important, and was certainly selected by him of set purpose (chapter 6). It was the day after the feeding of the five thousand, and the day after He walked on the Sea of Galilee. There is also in the context an allusion to the betrayal by Judas: 6<sup>64f</sup>, 'There are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him.' One can hardly avoid the thought that this allusion was intended to point the connexion between this exposition of underlying truth

and the outward circumstances and occasion of the Last Supper. Further, John draws special attention (6<sup>23</sup>) to the occasion, just before he reports the discourse on the meaning of the food given by God: 'Nigh unto the place where they ate the bread after the Lord had given thanks';<sup>1</sup> and here even in this brief reference he lays special emphasis on the importance of the 'giving thanks.' And once again he makes Jesus refer to some wonderful act in His opening words: 'Ye seek me . . . because ye ate of the loaves and were filled.'

John's account of the teaching of the Master regarding the mystic truth which was afterwards embodied in the Sacrament is contained in his sixth chapter. In this chapter Jesus explained to those who on the previous day had eaten of the loaves the meaning and nature of 'the bread from heaven.' The 'Father giveth you the true bread from heaven,' and 'I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' But 'no man can come unto me, except the Father which sent me draw him.' 'I am the living bread which came down out of heaven . . . and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.' 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves.'

In this discourse the gradual transition is clearly indicated from the simpler idea 'bread' through the stages 'bread from heaven,' and 'I am the bread of life' to the mystic saying 'he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him . . . he that eateth me, he shall live because of me.' But 'it is the spirit quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing' (6<sup>63</sup>).

I do not profess to be able to enter so perfectly into the Oriental mode of thought as to understand fully the final form which this exposition took in the mouth of Jesus as reported by John; but the observation of the successive steps by which the simple passes into the more mystic statement, enables even a Western mind to apprehend something of the meaning that the words had in the

<sup>1</sup> It is worthy of note that He 'gave thanks' (*εὐχαριστήσας*) before He distributed the loaves (as Jn. 6<sup>11</sup> expresses it); but Mark (followed by Luke and Matthew) says that He spoke a blessing (*εὐλόγησεν*). There is here the same variation, but differently distributed, as is found in the accounts of the Last Supper.

mind of John as he looked back in old age to that scene. Westcott remarks rightly that this discourse cannot 'be simply prophetic of the Sacrament,' and that 'it treats essentially of spiritual realities with which no external act, as such, can be co-extensive.' He quotes Augustine, 'believe, and thou *hast* eaten,' as giving the sum of the thoughts in a luminous and pregnant sentence. But, as Westcott goes on to say, 'the truth which is presented in its absolute form' in Jn 6 'is presented in a specific act and a concrete form in the Holy Communion.' And he regards the whole situation in the way that Jesus 'gave by anticipation a commentary, so to speak, on the Sacrament which He afterwards instituted.'

These words of Westcott's express the situation as well as any man can ever express for all others a truth which can be known only to one who has lived it, and which each man will express to himself in a different way according to the life whereby he has realized for himself the truth.

We must notice also that John explains why this earlier teaching had passed unobserved and unrecorded. It was beyond the comprehension of the disciples. Many of them even said, 'This is a hard saying,' and murmured at it, 6<sup>60</sup>; and the reply of Jesus seems to indicate John's belief that the truth had become intelligible to him and to all only after the Resurrection and the Ascension.

IX. St. Paul is in essential agreement with the Fourth Gospel (6<sup>31-59</sup>) as to the nature of the Sacrament: that the life-giving bread is Christ, and that life can be had only through eating that bread. He does not, it is true, express the principle in so mystic a form; but, when he draws the parallel between the sacrificial meal which was the force binding together the pagan society, as the communion of Dæmonic Powers, and the eating of the Eucharistic meal which was the communion of the body of Christ, and then shortly afterwards quotes the Saviour's own words, 'this is my body,' it seems irrational to doubt that he is expressing the view of the Fourth Gospel.

John's point of view is closely related to Paul's, but travels far beyond it, and reaches a different level of thought. In such a transcendental exposition of the absolute truth, there cannot possibly be any association with a fixed day, or month, or season, or year. John states the ultimate fact, which is always present as the foundation of the

Divine life in man. Yet he would hardly have laid such stress on the sensuous facts of eating and drinking, unless he had had the Sacrament in his mind as he wrote.

Paul has clear before him the practical problem, how is the scattered people of God to be united in a close fellowship and brotherhood? The sole bond that could effect this union was, of course, an ideal and mystic one: no external or temporal bond was sufficient. Paul insisted to the Corinthians that the Eucharist embodied a power which was strong enough for this purpose; and it is beyond doubt that he gave the same teaching to all his other Churches. The power that lay in the Rite could operate effectively only if the participants co-operated rightly in the act. God will not and cannot help men unless they do their part: the action must be mutual. But the power always is present in the Rite; if men do not participate rightly, and fail to perform their part in the act, the Rite is not merely neutralized: it becomes a force to destroy the unworthy participator. 'He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, unless he discern,' etc.

The nature of this power that lies in the Rite of the Bread, Paul does not explain clearly in his brief statement. The Divine nature is present in the Sacrament: the Saviour is with those who worthily participate, and thus they become a unified and single body. What further teaching the Apostle imparted to his converts beyond what he says in that Epistle we are not informed; but he evidently assumes that the Corinthians had learned to know his doctrine.

John stands entirely apart from the practical problem: he does not allude to the unification of the Church as a congeries of separate individuals. He only explains the mystic doctrine that every one who rightly partakes of this food from heaven becomes united with and merged in the Saviour's personality. In that is involved the unification of the Church; but John does not descend to the relation of man to man; he speaks only of the relation of man to God.

As to Paul, one would be inclined to say that the purely idealistic character of his words could not be misunderstood, were it not that they have been misinterpreted. He says clearly that, although an idol is nought, yet to eat at the table of an idol is to imperil or destroy the life and the character of a Christian; and that 'meat will not commend us

to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse, nor, if we eat, are we the better.' These things are material and nought in themselves. They become what the mind of man makes them. All that vast power for good or for evil which Paul

saw in the Sacrament was purely ideal, and lay in the spirit of the man who came to the Lord's Table, and in the degree to which he sympathized with the mind of the Saviour and with the life of the Brethren who sat along with him.

## The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

**Gen. iv. 1, 2.** 'Now the man had known Havvâh his wife' (cf. the similar construction in 1<sup>2</sup>). This implies that the knowledge had begun before the expulsion from Paradise, and not immediately after it, as commentators usually assume. It was the birth of Cain which took place after the expulsion. Cain, or Cainan (v.<sup>9</sup>), 'the smith,' answers to the Babylonian *ummânu*; while Abel, as was pointed out many years ago by Oppert, is the Bab. Abil, 'son,' which was borrowed also by the Sumerians under the form of *ibila*. The initial vowel is represented in the Heb. transcription by ה, as in הכל, *hêkal*, from Bab. *êkalû*, Sumerian *ê-gal*; cf. also the name of Abraham for Aba-ramu. The latter part of v.<sup>1</sup>, explaining the name of Cain from the verb *qânâh*, is a late insertion, like most of the etymological notes in Genesis; it is inconsistent with the statement in 4<sup>26</sup>, and is unaccompanied by a corresponding explanation of the name of Abel, the reason being that *hebel* in Heb. meant 'vanity,' which did not suit the character ascribed to Abel in the history.

רֹעֶה צֹאן, *ro'êh zôn*, 'shepherd of a flock,' is an Assyrianism, *rêu tsîni* in Ass. being used in contradistinction to *rêu alpê*, 'ox-herd'; *rêu ittsuri*, 'bird-keeper'; *rêu sattukki*, 'keeper of the daily sacrifice,' etc. 'Tiller of the ground' is a translation of the Ass. *ikkaru*, which is derived from the Sumerian *engar*, 'the ground,' and is ideographically expressed by UR-APIN, 'man of the ground'; that is to say, 'the peasant' or 'fella,' as distinguished from the NU-GISSAR, or 'gardener,' as Adam had been in Paradise. The population of Babylonia consisted of agriculturists (*ikkari*) and artisans (*ummânu*), the former inhabiting the country, and the latter the town, the whole body of them being collectively called *ummânu*. In contrast to them were the uncultured West Semitic nomads, whose home was in the desert on the west side of the Euphrates,

but who tended the flocks of their Babylonian masters, and many of whom pitched their tents on the river-banks of Southern Babylonia. Wool was a staple industry of the Babylonians, and the flocks were all herded by the West Semitic Beduin. Hence the shepherd represented the West Semitic Beduin, while the peasant and artisan constituted the civilized population of Babylonia. In one sense they might be called brothers, since they alike spoke Semitic languages, and a certain portion of the Babylonian people belonged to the Semitic race.

In the story of Cain and Abel, therefore, we have a reflexion of the relations between the two adjoining populations as they were regarded from the Beduin point of view. The elder brother is naturally the Babylonian master, to whom the Beduin shepherd stood in somewhat of the relation of the wife to the husband (v.<sup>7</sup>); he possessed metal weapons of destruction (vv.<sup>8. 22. 23</sup>), was the builder of cities (v.<sup>17</sup>), and exchanged agriculture for the artisan's craft (vv.<sup>12. 22</sup>).<sup>1</sup>

**3, 4.** The Hebrew translated 'in process of time' would be *ina kit yumê* in Assyrian; but the original phrase was probably *ina yumê-su*, 'at that time,' as the reference is to the time when Cain and Abel were already respectively an agriculturist and a shepherd. The ground had already been cursed (3<sup>17</sup>); hence the fruit of it was not acceptable to Yahweh, who had cursed it. On the other hand, Yahweh was the God of the Sutu or West Semitic Beduin (4<sup>26</sup>), whose offering to Him was the best of their possessions—the firstlings, namely, of their

<sup>1</sup> The fact that the word *ummânu*, 'smith,' came to be applied (as in the story of the Deluge) to the whole body of the Babylonian population, so as to include 'the peasant' as well as 'the smith,' would explain how Kain, the first 'smith,' has absorbed the first *amel-ikkari* (Heb. 'ish hâ-adâmâh), or 'agriculturist,' who, according to 9<sup>20</sup>, was really Nukhum, or Noah (see notes on 5<sup>29</sup> and 9<sup>20</sup>).

flocks, together with their milk (reading  $\text{הָלַב}$  instead of  $\text{הָלַב}$ , a punctuation due to the regulations of the Levitical Law; Lv 3<sup>16</sup>).

'Yahweh regarded Abel and his offering, but Cain and his offering he did not regard.' The Assyrian equivalent of  $\text{יָשַׁע}$  is *istenī'a*, from *se'u*; but it is probable that *atū*, the synonym of *se'u*, was found in the original, since that is used in the sense which  $\text{שָׁעָה}$  has in this passage. Thus Esarhaddon says of Merodach: *ina pukhur ākhēa rabāti tutta-nni*, 'among all my elder brothers thou hast regarded (i.e. chosen) me.' Yahweh's choice, it will be noticed, had nothing to do with the character of the brothers. A parallel passage is found in the Babylonian story of the Deluge (xi. 160-161), where the offering was of the fruits of the earth, like that of Cain: 'the gods smelt the savour, the gods smelt the sweet savour,' and consequently accepted both it and the offerer. The gods of the Babylonian agriculturist naturally preferred the fruits of Eden to the firstlings of the flock.

The ordinary Assyrian phrase was *dullukhu pantu-su*, 'his countenance was troubled.'

7. A proverb is quoted in this verse of which we have the Babylonian original in the Legend of the Plague-god (K 2619. 6), [*Ur*]ra *rabitsu abulli-su*, 'the Plague-god is lying in wait at his door.' Here the Semitic *Ḥaṭṭāth*, used as a proper name without the article (like *Tehôm*, Gn 1<sup>2</sup>), takes the place of the Sumerian *Ur-ra* (originally *Gūr-ra*). *Ḥaṭṭāth* is the Assyrian *khaṭītu*, or *khiṭītu*, 'sin,' as in the phrase: *summa khaṭītu izir ilu-su itti-su ittalak*, 'if he hates sin, his god walks with him.' Corresponding with *Ḥaṭṭāth* is *Sēēth*, also used as a proper name without the article, which takes the place of *Ḥaṭṭāth* in the alternative form of the proverb: 'If thou doest well, is not *Sēēth* (watching at the door)?' The Babylonians, in fact, regarded the *rabitsu*, or 'liar in wait,' from two points of view; he was either the demon who lay in wait to enter and punish sin, or he was the 'guardian-bull,' who also was a *rabitsu*, in its secondary sense of 'watchman,' appointed to prevent evil from entering the house.<sup>1</sup> Thus in the Chedor-laomer texts we read: 'When the liar-in-wait welcomed [the enemy], the guardian-bull (*sēdu*) of Ê-Sarra departed (from it)' (*P.S.B.A.*, Dec. 1906, p. 241). The name of the *sēdu*, or

'protecting spirit of the house,' was also employed in a wider sense to include all the spirits, whether good or evil, who 'lay in wait at the door'; even *Isum*, the messenger of *Ur-ra*, is called a *sēdu*. *Sēdu* is also written *sētu*, like *satē* for *sadē* (Heb. *sādeh*) in the Tel el-Amarna letters from Jerusalem. In the proverb as quoted in Genesis *sēdu*, *sētu*, has been assimilated to *ḥaṭṭāth*, and so made to resemble *sētu*, 'friend' (cf.  $\text{שָׁדָה}$ , Ec 2<sup>8</sup>). The original of the Heb. version would have been: *summa tiṭibbi, Sētu abulla rabitsu; ū summa lā tiṭibbi, Khaṭītu (Ur-ra) rabitsu abulla*. The meaning of the passage had been forgotten when the Septuagint translation was made.

The West Semitic Beduin kept the flocks of their Babylonian masters, to whom, therefore, they owed service. Hence, so far as mastership was concerned, the relationship was like that of the wife to her husband (3<sup>16</sup>), from which also the words 'unto thee shall be his desire' have been taken. But, however appropriate these latter words may be to the husband, they are quite out of place when the relations of two brothers are in question, and consequently cannot have been in the original text. Moreover, there is no subject to 'his' and 'him.' In place of the very inappropriate 'And unto thee shall be his desire,' we need 'He is thy younger brother.'

8. There is another omission of the original text in the verse which begins, 'And Cain said to Abel his brother . . .' The words, however, are lost. The insertion of the Septuagint, 'Let us go into the field,' probably represents the sense of the original, and may have been derived from it. If so, the words must have dropped out after the period when the Septuagint translation was made.

*Sādeh*, 'the field,' is the Babylonian *siddu*, and was a technical term denoting the cultivated land on the bank of a Babylonian river or canal which was watered by means of *shadufs*. It was, therefore, the special property of the agriculturist Cain, in contradistinction to the *edinu*, or 'plain,' where the flocks were pastured by the shepherd Abel.

9. Cain disclaims all knowledge as to where his brother is, the *siddu* and the *edinu* being distinct. His own province is the *siddu*, and, as he leaves the *edinu* to his brother, he cannot guard him from assailants, either as the *sēdu* guards the agriculturist's house, or as the nomad shepherd guards his flock. The Bab. original of Cain's

<sup>1</sup> In the Tel el-Amarna tablets the Egyptian commissioners are called *rabitsi*.

reply would have been: *ul îdi; natsir akhiya anaku?*

10. In Assyrian it would be: *iqbi-ma: minâ tepus? qûl damê akhi-ka itsarakh (or tsarikh) ana eli-ya ultu qaggari.* The *v.l.* 𐤒𐤕𐤕 must be substituted for the ungrammatical 𐤒𐤕𐤕, 'zoăkîm' of the Massoretic text. It was the 'voice of the

blood' that cried out, not the blood. Yahweh was the guardian of the West Semitic shepherds, though Cain disclaimed being so, and He would avenge their death. The blood of the murdered man called to Him from that 'irrigated soil' from which the agriculturist took his name (*ikkaru*), and which he regarded as his own property.

## Contributions and Comments.

### The Coat without Seam.

DOES any English commentary or translation call attention to the fact, that in the description of the coat without seam (Jn 19<sup>20</sup>) the words ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν, 'from the top,' may be connected with the preceding ἄραφος, *seamless*, instead of with the following ὑφαντός, *woven*, which has the addition δι' ὅλου, *throughout*? The coat was without seam from, *i.e.*, at the top, or the upper parts. No German book which I have been able to consult mentions this possibility. And yet it is followed not only by Cyprian and the Codex *c*: 'de tunica autem quia de superiore parte non consutilis, sed per totum textilis fuerat, but also by the Syriac translation, which is rendered by Gwilliam: 'tunica autem eius erat absque sutura a summo, contexta tota' (ܐܠܗܐ ܡܢ ܠܥܠ ܘܩܝܪܬܐ ܠܥܠ).<sup>1</sup> This explanation, which needs only the removal of a comma, seems to be recommended by the gloss of the lexicographer Hesychius (quoted already by Wettstein, 1752), who defines σύμπορπον as τὸν μὴ ῥαφαῖς συνειλημμένον κατὰ τοὺς ὤμους χιτῶνα, the coat which is not kept together by seams on the shoulders; and the description of the priest's dress by Josephus (*Ant.* III. vii. 4): ἔστι δὲ ὁ χιτῶν οὗτος οὐκ ἐκ δυοῖν περιτμημάτων ὥστε ῥαπτὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων εἶναι καὶ τῶν παρὰ πλευράν: this coat does not consist of two sheets, so that it would be *sewn together on the shoulders and at the sides.* The expression of Josephus, (μὴ or οὐ) ῥαπτὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων is = ἄραφος ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν. There are editions of the Greek Testament which have no comma either before or after ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν, but I know of

none with a comma after ἄνωθεν.<sup>2</sup> In the *D.B.* I looked under 'Coat' and 'Seam' in vain for some elucidation about the 'seamless robe'; the *D.C.G.* makes the omission good under 'Coat,' giving a reference under 'Seam' to this article.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

### The Aramaic Name of the Passover.

THE *D.B.* states in the art. 'Passover' (iii. 688): 'Name.—ܡܨܚܐ, J.-Aram. ܡܨܚܐ, Syr. ܡܨܚܐ, and hence πάσχα.' A similar statement is repeated in *D.C.G.* ii. 324: '(Heb. ܡܨܚܐ, *pesakh*; Aram. ܡܨܚܐ, *pascha*; in Greek, πάσχα,' etc. In the *E.B.* I do not find a reference to the Aramaic form, but in Preuschen's *New Dictionary of the Greek Testament* I meet the same statement—'Aram. ܡܨܚܐ.' It is not necessary to multiply references.

In reality the Aramaic form is ܡܨܚܐ(ܐ), *pis-hā*; see Dalman's *Grammar* (2nd ed., p. 138; correct in the Index under πάσχα, the wrong reference '126'), or E. Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, p. 10, who wrote twenty-five years ago: 'The Jewish tradition demands ܡܨܚܐ, with which also the Syriac *pes-chā* corresponds.' It is the same difference of pronunciation that we have in Miryam—Maryam; Simson—Samson, etc.

When Dalman, *l.c.*, thinks the π of πάσχα due to assimilation with πάσχω, I cannot see why the

<sup>1</sup> James Murdock, in his literal translation from the Syriac Peshitto Version renders: 'And his tunic was without seam from the top, woven throughout.' In the Syriac Codex from Sinai the passage is missing.

<sup>2</sup> A similar difference of punctuation, to which the A.V. and R.V. do not call attention, is Rev 5<sup>1</sup>: 'A book written within and on the back, sealed with seven seals'; to which punctuation others prefer: 'A book written within, and on the back sealed with seven seals.'

Greek translators of the O.T. should have felt themselves reminded of this Greek root by the Aramaic name of the Hebrew Festival. It is, of course, quite different with the people of the early Church. In other books of the Septuagint we have the transliteration *φάσκ*. Did the originators of this form think of *φάσκειν*? EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

### "Worthily."

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May 1910, page 383, you call attention to an article in the *Missionary Record* by Mr. Philip, on the word 'worthily' in the New Testament. Three occurrences of the word are mentioned—Ro 16<sup>2</sup>, Ph 1<sup>27</sup>, 3 Jn 6 and the inconsistency of translation in the A.V. and R.V. is pointed out. But why not note the three other places where the word occurs, Eph 4<sup>1</sup>, Col 1<sup>10</sup>, 1 Th 2<sup>12</sup>, and also the further fact that the American Standard Version gives 'worthily' in each place except Ph 1<sup>27</sup>, where 'worthy' is retained with the margin as in R.V., 'behave as citizens worthily'? It is not the first time that after reading some criticism of the R.V. in some English periodical, I have turned to the A.S.R.V. and found the reading that the critic says ought to be in the text. These six places are the only ones where the Greek word appears, and ought to be studied together in any study of the word 'worthily.' It will then be found even more helpful than the study to which you refer.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Auburn Theological Seminary, New York.

### An Outline of Assyrian Grammar.<sup>1</sup>

THIS Outline of Assyrian Grammar will be found of very great service by students, and will form a convenient *vade mecum* for those engaged in the decipherment of tablets. It is the work of a scholar who shows himself conversant with every department of the study. The texts selected are a proof of this. One is historical, two epistolary,

<sup>1</sup> *An Outline of Assyrian Grammar*, by Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S. Pp. vi, 64, 8vo, cloth lettered, 5s. London: H. J. Glashier, 55 and 57 Wigmore Street, W. 1910.

and six commercial. There is also given a Babylonian proverb, a list of Babylonian proper names, many of which have a Biblical reference, and a page of Babylonian Students' Exercises. One of the chief merits of the book is that it keeps before the view the Babylonian system of writing, which differs materially from the Assyrian. This difference is well exhibited in a list of 333 signs giving the Babylonian characters with their Assyrian equivalents. The list would have been of still more service had the numbers been co-ordinated to those of the Sign-list (pp. 49-58), which contains 366 signs with their syllabic and ideographic values. The list of the months on p. 60 will also be very helpful. The grammar itself calls for no detailed criticism. A feature of it is the introduction on every page of examples of Assyrian and Babylonian writing alongside the transcription, by which the student is familiarized with the cuneiform at the same time that he learns to master the language. The section on Numerals is specially instructive. The Verb receives lucid treatment.

The texts (two in number), facing the title-page, are new, as are those on p. 62 (Nos. 1-3). No. 4 on p. 62 and Nos. 1 and 2 on p. 63 are found in Professor Stevenson's Assyrian and Babylonian Contracts. These three contain Aramaic reference notes, here reproduced with their Hebrew equivalents. A comparison with Stevenson brings to light several minor differences, mostly in numbers. *Ginû*, not translated by Stevenson, is transliterated by Pinches *gin-na*, and rendered 'standard(?).' (The reference is to [white] silver shekels.) No. 2 on p. 63 gives the substance of the tablet as 'the price of the meal for the Arabians(?),' as against Stevenson's (No. 36) 'the price of . . . , belonging to the Aramæan.' (Ar-ba-a-a v. Ar-ma-a-a.)

The docket to No. 1, p. 63, reads: 'Concerning the silver which he has given to Iribaya.' From this it is concluded that 'the last element of the name Sennacherib should be read not erba, but -iriba(y)a or -êriba(y)a. The ending -a(y)a was apparently dropped.' To substantiate this, reference is made to No. 28 of the list of names on p. 63, where the Babylonian writing is attended by the Aramaic equivalent = אִרְבַּי, and is read Iriba-a ('he (the god) has augmented'). The feminine name Arabatum, p. 64, 34a b, may also be compared. On the other hand, one notes that the

syllabic spelling of 9b on the same page is Bêl-er-ba.

On p. 46, l. 12, 83-1-18, 268 should read 82-3-23, 268, cf. p. 62, note \*. The reference is to an Aramaic word שָׁבָא, probably Šaba, which, however, Stevenson reproduces שֶׁבֶר (ב) doubtful), and translates 'the weaver (?)'.

Pp. 49-64 are autograph, and are executed with the utmost care. The only cuneiform sign that causes trouble is p. 64, 24b (No. 5). Defects in the writing otherwise are to be found: p. 50, ll. 4, 37; p. 51 (2nd col.), l. 14; p. 52 (2nd col.), l. 21; p. 53, l. 3; p. 54 (2nd col.), l. 6; p. 56 (2nd col.), l. 44.

The Outline is designed to be 'the forerunner to a much more complete and detailed exposition of the language, though the issue of such a book will probably depend upon the success with which the present Outline may meet' (see Preface). Success the Outline well merits, because of its accuracy, its comprehensiveness, and its suitability to the needs of the ordinary student of the language. In view of the large amount of cuneiform writing contained in the book it is marvellously cheap.

WILLIAM CRUICKSHANK.

Kinneff.

## In Necessariis Unitas.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of February 1907, Professor E. Nestle contributed an interesting article on the authorship of this beautiful saying, which is found in the writings of Richard Baxter, and was a favourite quotation of Dean Stanley's. The article by Bertheau, in Herzog, leaves it somewhat doubtful if R. Meldenius, whom Professor Nestle proves to have been Peter Meiderlin of Augsburg, is the real author of the phrase. May not R. M. and R. Baxter have quoted from a common source, since Baxter says the words are the 'old despised words of the pacificator?' A closer examination of Baxter's work shows that he has really quoted from R. Meldenius. The extract from Baxter, given by the German scholars, is really a secondary one from the preface. I find on reading the book itself, viz. *The True and Only Way of Concord of all the Christian Churches*, London, 1680, that in Part iii. p. [25], Baxter says: Sect. xiv. 'Were there no more said of all this subject but that of *Rupertus Meldenius*, cited by *Conradus Bergius*,

it might end all schisms if well understood and used, viz. "Si in necessariis unitas, in non-necessariis libertas, in utrisque charitas, optimo certe loco essent res nostrae." Unity in things necessary, liberty in things unnecessary, and charity in both, would do all our work.' Baxter was writing more than fifty years after Meiderlin, so he might well call his words 'old.' He mentions a great many other 'pacificators' besides R. Meldenius, especially the Scotsman, John Dury, but he shows no knowledge that R. M. is an anagram. DAVID M. W. LAIRD.

New College, Edinburgh.

## The Date of the First Gospel.

ARCHDEACON W. C. ALLEN's article on this subject in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for July is a striking illustration of the present tendency of scholars to go back to old-fashioned views. Just sixty years ago, the Rev. T. R. Birks, who was afterwards a Cambridge Professor (I think of Moral Philosophy), published his *Horæ Evangelicæ*, in which, *inter alia*, he argued for a still earlier date for 'Matthew,' not later than 44 A.D. Among his reasons one is worth recalling. St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John in their crucifixion narrative always speak of Pilate by his name, not as 'the governor'; but Matthew seven times mentions 'the governor' without his name. Would a writer have naturally used the phrase in that way after 44 A.D., when for the first time a successor of Pilate bore the same title? So urged Birks; and, of course, it was part of an argument for 'Matthew' being the first Gospel written, a view now abandoned.

EUGENE STOCK.

London.

## The Story of Samson.<sup>1</sup>

DR. STAHN is a thoroughgoing advocate of the mythological view. For him 'an investigation of the Bible stories of Samson is a task for the science of comparative religion' (p. 1). He therefore compares the various episodes in Samson's life

<sup>1</sup> *Die Simson-Sage: Eine religions-geschichtliche Untersuchung über Richter 13-16.* Von Dr. Hermann Stahn. Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht. Pp. 81. M.2.40.

with corresponding narratives of Herakles, Dionysos, Ra and Isis, and other gods and heroes of ethnic religions, and finds the doughty hero to be a manifestation of the sun-god worshipped in the neighbourhood of Beth-Shemesh, whose cult was finally displaced by that of Jahweh some time after the reign of David (p. 78 ff.). The personal character and adventures of Samson are all brought under this category. The name שמשון is probably a modification of שמש, *the sun*, carried out in the interests of pure Jahweh-worship. His seven locks are the sun's golden rays, which wax bright and strong at midday, but are shorn off at nightfall. His birth is compared with the miraculous origin of Herakles and Perseus—both of them solar heroes. His adventure with the lion has also a solar significance—the lion being the symbol of the sun's might among many ancient nations. The burning of the cornfields by the blazing foxtails is likewise a symbolical representation of the action of the sun. Even Samson's dwelling in the cleft of the rock of Etam symbolizes the midnight resting of the sun in his 'hole' beneath the earth. His blinding also relates to the failure of the sun's light at even. The snapping of the bonds represents the bursting forth of the sun in his morning glory. The two pillars of Dagon's temple are the 'pillars of heaven' through which he bursts. His death is the final extinguishing of the light. And even his enthrallment by Delilah symbolizes the nightly conquest of the sun; the name דלילה being but another form of לילה, *night* (p. 32 ff.).

Comparative mythology has won its rightful place as a science. But it must not presume to dominate the whole field of human thought. By the comparison of isolated details, every historical fact and personality may readily be resolved into insubstantial elements in a mythological scheme. In this way, Jensen has recently educed practically the whole of ancient history from the Gilgamesh *motif*. No doubt, mythological speculations play a large part in the life of ancient nations. But life itself is more than mythology; and the main interests of men have always been in life. The idealizing imagination of primitive peoples delights chiefly to play around figures of flesh and blood. In our mythological studies, therefore, we must not lose sight of the actualities of life. The attribution to Samson of adventures that assume quite superhuman proportions, or even the weaving of

ætiological myths like the origin of the names Ramath-lehi (Jg 15<sup>17</sup>) and En-hakkore (Jg 15<sup>19</sup>) into the web of his life-story, is no real proof that he is a mythological figure. We find precisely the same phenomena in all folk-lore. Legendary elements tend to cluster round the heroes of popular tradition. But the actual personality of the hero must first be there for the wreath of honour to cluster round.

It must be remembered, too, that the influence of mythology wanes as we approach the age of contemporary history. The adventures of Samson stand on the very threshold of such an age. The Philistines have already appeared on the scene, and Israel has been drawn into its life and death struggle. This is no age for sun-myths, but one for daring deeds. The popular imagination of Israel has thrown a nimbus of more than mortal glory around the head of its hero. But Samson does emerge to view as the first heroic figure who dared to withstand the hated enemy, and wrought them deadly mischief. On this reading of his story, the somewhat strange blending of the national and religious finds its explanation. In Israel's struggle with the Philistines the cause of Jahweh was involved. Therefore the champion of the people was the champion of their God as well. Samson's personal character fell far short of the standard of ethical religion. But his deeds of prowess against the common enemy caused him to be regarded with truth as one raised up and called by Jahweh to fight for His honour, one whom the spirit of Jahweh stirred to heroic enterprises.

A. R. GORDON.

Montreal.

### When did Stephen Langton die?

THE name of Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, is dear to every learned friend of the Bible as the name of the man to whom we owe its division into chapters. But when did he die? One set of books says 1227, the other 1228. It would be easy to multiply quotations; let it suffice to quote one for each statement, both published by the Publishers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

A. Stewart (article 'Bible,' *D.B.* i. 288) says: 'Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, died 1227,' referring to Gregory, *Prolegomena to Tischendorf's N.T.*, 8th ed. p. 164. But there

Gregory says: 'mortuo a. 1228,' and he repeats the same year as late as 1907 in his *Canon and Text of the N.T.*, p. 473: 'Cardinal Stephen Langton, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who died in 1228.'

Which is the true date?

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

### Acts xxi. 39.

THE striking parallel from Xenophon to 1 Jn 3<sup>19</sup>, published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, reminds me of another parallel.

In Ac 21<sup>39</sup> almost all editions punctuate Ταρσεύς, τῆς Κιλικίας οὐκ ἀσήμουν πόλεως πολίτης; Westcott-Hort, on the contrary, Ταρσεὺς τῆς Κιλικίας, οὐκ, etc., as in 22<sup>3</sup>. The very same difference of punctuation occurs in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, i. ii. 23. Most editions that I have seen punctuate εἰς Ταρσοῦς, τῆς Κιλικίας πόλιν μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα; only Rehdantz, εἰς Ταρσοῦς τῆς Κιλικίας, πόλιν μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα. In both cases I am inclined to agree with the minority.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

### Where were the Disciples?

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. xxi. p. 379, Professor Mackintosh makes the very reasonable suggestion that while Jesus was engaged in His Judæan ministry, the disciples were busy upon one of their evangelizing journeys, and asks whether this view has ever been proposed before.

Like him, I can find no reference to it in Dr.

Smith's book, *The Days of His Flesh*. On the contrary, Dr. Smith seems to believe that upon the journey described in Jn 7, Jesus was accompanied by the Twelve (p. 301).

The view suggested by Professor Mackintosh has been advocated before, however. In his book, *New Light on the Life of Jesus* (Scribner's, 1904), Professor C. A. Briggs, of Union Seminary, New York, devotes the fourth chapter (pp. 40-49) to a discussion of the question: 'Where was Jesus during the absence of the Twelve?' and he finds the answer in the Judæan ministry recorded by John. 'I have asked several eminent New Testament scholars this question,' he says, 'but not one of them had thought of it before, or could give me an answer' (p. 40, note). The theory advanced by Professor Briggs is that Jesus divided Galilee among ten of the Twelve, sending them out two by two, and Himself accompanied the remaining pair, James and John (cf. Lk 9<sup>51-56</sup>), on a mission to Peræa (cf. Lk.), and Judæa. The two brothers would naturally be taken into Judæa because of their evident familiarity with the capital. This would also account for John's minute record of the incidents and conversations in Jerusalem. This view 'fills the gap in time which the absence of ten of the Twelve required by a sufficient amount of active ministry of Jesus to satisfy all conditions of the problem' (p. 49). I have only hinted at the reasons which Professor Briggs states at some length in this most interesting chapter. And this chapter, Professor Briggs tells us at the close of his preface, was printed as an article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for November 1903.

M. B. DAVIDSON.

Toronto, Canada.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### New Testament.

1. *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, von Caspar René Gregory: Dritter Band. The third volume is just as necessary for the student of the New Testament text as the first or second. To others it is nothing at all. Yet the volume should have a considerable sale in this country. For the references to British scholarship are very numerous, much more numerous than the references to

German scholarship or any other (Leipzig: Hinrichs. M. 12).

2. *Evangelium Gatianum*. Dr. Joseph Michael Heer of Freiburg has produced an edition of the Codex Gatianus, which contains the four Gospels in a Latin version. He has furnished his edition with Latin prolegomena and textual footnotes. This Codex, which Dr. Heer proves to have been of Irish origin, is of special importance in that, while agreeing on the whole with the Vulgate, it

contains readings, and those not a few, which are in accord with some of the oldest manuscripts of the Gospels, not to speak of some remarkable readings which are peculiar to itself (Freiburg: Herder. M.14).

3. *Die Stammbäume Jesu nach Matthäus und Lukas.* Dr. Heer is also the author of a volume on the Genealogy of our Lord according to the First and Third Gospels. One cannot be sure, but it does not seem likely that the subject has ever before received such a thorough investigation as this is. There are three appendixes. The first is on the ancient *Damnatio Memoriae*. The second is a study by Herr Leo Wohleb on the co-ordination of sentences in the narrative style of St. Matthew's Gospel. It contains tables of the number of occurrences of various Greek particles. The third appendix exhibits Mt 1<sup>16</sup> according to the more important versions and manuscripts (Freiburg: Herder. M.6).

4. *La Vie privée du Peuple Juif à l'époque de Jésus Christ.* This is not simply a history of the Jews in the time of our Lord; it is a study of their private life,—a very much more difficult matter to study than their public and political life. It is a contribution to the literature of the Social Problem quite as much as to the literature of Ancient Israel. The author, Père M.-B. Schwalm, has endeavoured to make his book as complete as possible, but the references to modern literature are comparatively few. Probably there is not much modern literature to refer to (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1910).

5. *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen nach den ältesten jüdischen Angaben.* In this volume Professor Dr. Hermann L. Strack gives the texts, translation and annotations on all the passages in Hebrew which were written by Jews in the earliest times about Christ or Christianity. Those who know Dr. Strack are well aware that he is the last man to do this for the purpose of raising prejudice against the Jews. His object is just the opposite of that; it is to remove foolish prejudice (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910).

6. *La Résurrection de Jésus.* To their 'Bibliothèque Apologetique,' Messrs. Beauchesne of Paris have added a volume on the Resurrection, by Abbé E. Mangenot, Professor of Sacred Scripture at the Catholic Institute in Paris. Abbé Mangenot has no doubt about the fact of the Resurrection, but he knows that other people have

doubts, and respects them. He knows the French literature best, and the German literature next. Of Loisy he has naturally much to say. The volume contains two appendixes, one on the Crucifixion, and the other on the Ascension (Fr.3.50).

7. *Les Sources du Récit Johannique de la Passion,* par Maurice Goguel, Professeur à la Faculté libre de Théologie protestante de Paris (Paris: Fischbacher, 1910).

8. *Wellhausen und Johannes,* von Caspar René Gregory (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910).

9. *La Valeur historique du Quatrième Evangile.* Professor Lepin of Lyons has already made himself known by the issue of several theological and critical works, but more especially by the publication of a volume on the authorship and origin of the Fourth Gospel. That volume has already reached a third edition. The author has now issued in two volumes a study of the historical value of the same Gospel. It is the work of a Roman Catholic, but it is in much closer agreement with the best British scholarship on the subject than is the work of average German Protestantism at present. The author's acquaintance with English Biblical literature is evident on every page. He feels as he writes, and we feel as we read him, that in the study of the Gospel according to John no such distinction as Roman or Anglican is even for a moment to be remembered (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1910. Fr.8).

10. *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus.* Dr. Martin Debelius has in this volume examined all the passages in St. Paul's Epistles which touch upon angels or spirits. His purpose is purely scientific, not apologetic, and the volume is a valuable storehouse of information on this difficult and now much derided subject. The indexes of subjects, Greek words, texts, and references to ancient Christian and pagan literature will be particularly useful (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht; Glasgow: F. Bauermeister, 1909. M.7).

11. *Die Thessalonicher-Briefe.* In the new edition of Meyer, the Epistles to Thessalonians have been edited by Professor Ernst von Dobschütz of Strassburg, the author of the great article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* on the 'Bible in the Church.' Professor von Dobschütz is a man of extraordinary range of knowledge, which he carries so unconsciously that to make his acquaintance is one of the greatest pleasures of one's

life. Here, we should say, nothing that will elucidate a reference in the Epistles escapes him. But more than the weight of learning is the evidence of genuine spiritual sympathy with the Epistles themselves (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht; Glasgow: F. Bauermeister, 1909. M.6.40).

12. *Épîtres de Saint Paul*. Professor G. Tournier of Rochelle has published the first volume of Expositions of the Pauline Epistles, or, as he calls it, 'Lessons in Exegesis.' The volume contains an exposition in paragraphs of the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, the Epistle to the Galatians, and the two Epistles to the Corinthians. The exposition is in each case preceded by an introduction to the

Epistle, and to the whole work is prefixed an account of the Apostle's life and ministry (Paris: Beauchesne et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1910. Fr.5).

13. *Der Hebräerbrief in zeitgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*. Under this title Dr. Bernhard Weiss has published ten essays on the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which he discusses almost all the great questions which arise out of a study of the Epistle itself. It is the custom with our own expositors to give what they call 'Additional Notes.' These are the 'Additional Notes' to Hebrews of a great German commentator, and they will stand to be compared with Westcott's on the same Epistle (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910. M.3.50).

## Entre Nous.

### Count Leo Tolstoy and the Study of Religion.

In the *Christian Commonwealth* for June 29 there is published the translation of a long letter which Tolstoy has sent to the editor of the Russian review entitled *Life for All*. He says that for some time he has been impressed with the necessity of encouraging men to make a thorough study of religion throughout the world, and he has himself determined to edit a series of books or pamphlets each dealing with some religion or aspect of religion.

'I consider,' he says, 'a knowledge of the elements of the religions of the world by which the whole of humanity has lived and lives to be one of the most important and necessary branches of knowledge for every man, and ignorance in this respect one of the principal reasons of the weakening of religious consciousness among the people of our times, among the majority of people, the so-called lower classes, as among the so-called intellectuals. The weakening of religious consciousness among people of the working classes is caused, in my opinion, pre-eminently because those people are educated in complete ignorance of the beliefs of other nations, and in the assurance of the exclusive truth of their own religion. Educated in that manner, people of the working classes at the present stage of their intellectual development naturally meet, in the religious assertions taught to them as certain truth, some which they are

already unable to believe. And at the same time all the maxims of the faith taught to them are so indissolubly bound up with the acknowledgment of the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures and the infallibility of the Church that, not having the strength to separate the more essential truth from the less essential, people cease to believe the whole teaching of the Church.'

### Also.

Dr. A. C. Dixon of Chicago has sent to *The Sword and the Trowel* for July a study of some of the occurrences in the Bible of the word 'also.' He takes these passages.

Mt 10<sup>4</sup>, 'Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.' He calls this the also of shame. That 'also' has added to the name of Judas the epithet with which it will ever be associated—'Judas the traitor.'

Ro 5<sup>3</sup>, 'We glory in tribulations also'; or, as in R.V., 'Let us also rejoice in our tribulations'—the 'also' of tribulation. The Apostle says that we rejoice in hope of the glory of God—our faces are toward the sunrise. But we look around us also, not regarding the sorrows of life as out of harmony with its joys and hopes. These two aspects of life should not fight a duel, but play a duet.

2 Ti 1<sup>5</sup>, 'The unfeigned faith that is in thee; which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy

mother Eunice; and, I am persuaded, in thee also.' This is the 'also' of expectation. What Paul *saw* in Lois and Eunice he expected of Timothy; and so persuaded was he that the same faith would be found in him, that he calls it the unfeigned faith that *is* in thee.

Lk 10<sup>39</sup>, 'She had a sister called Mary, which also sat at the Lord's feet and heard his word'—the 'also' of devotion. This 'also' is Mary's vindication. She attended to her household duties; she also sat at Jesus' feet. Once a day at a certain hour a white handkerchief fluttered from the tent door of General Gordon. It was the hour of prayer within the tent. Gordon did his duty as a soldier; he also sat at Jesus' feet.

Mk 1<sup>38</sup>, 'Let us go elsewhere into the next towns, that I may preach there also.' This is the 'also' of the evangelist, the 'also' of the missionary. We are to tell those at home the good news; we are also to tell those abroad. Beginning from Jerusalem, that men who know us may take knowledge of us, let us go into other towns also, and on into all the world.

Jn 14<sup>8</sup>, 'That where I am, there ye may be also.' It is the 'also' of final fellowship; it is the hook of steel which binds us to one who is more than a friend, to a Brother. Let us treat Him here, says Dr. Dixon, as we expect Him to treat us there.

#### Pink and Blue.

When she went to the party, Elizabeth Lou  
Had her hair tied on top with a ribbon of  
blue.

But she hadn't a very good time, and I think  
'Twas because of a girl with a ribbon of pink.  
'For all the girls chose her, the whole evening  
through,  
Just because she wore pink!' sobbed Elizabeth  
Lou.

At the very next party, Elizabeth Lou  
Wore a ribbon herself of a roseate hue.  
But would you believe it? That same girl was  
there

With a bowknot of blue tying up her brown  
hair,  
And the very same thing proved again to be  
true:

'They still like her best!' wept Elizabeth Lou.

Now between you and me, it had nothing to do  
With those crisp little loopings of pink and  
blue.

But one little girl wore a smile on her face,  
The other a frown in the very same place.  
A smile and a frown! Now which of the two  
Do you fancy was worn by Elizabeth Lou?

PAULINE FRANCES CAMP.

#### The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. James Mursell, City Tabernacle Baptist Church, Brisbane, to whom a copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for September must be received by the 1st of August. The text is Ps 1<sup>3</sup>.

The Great Text for October is Ps 4<sup>6</sup>:

'Many there be that say, Who will shew us any good?

Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us.'

A copy of Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology*, or Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*, or Inge's *Faith and Knowledge*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for November is Ps 8<sup>3, 4</sup>:

'When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,

The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;

What is man that thou art mindful of him?

And the son of man, that thou visitest him?'

A copy of Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, or Barry's *Ideals and Principles of Church Reform*, along with Anderson's *St. Matthew's Gospel*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for December is Ps 9<sup>9, 10</sup>:

'The Lord also will be a high tower for the oppressed,

A high tower in times of trouble;

And they that know thy name will put their trust in thee;

For thou, Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek thee.'

A copy of Durell's *Self-Revelation of our Lord*, or two volumes of Plummer's *English Church History*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for January is Ps 11<sup>3</sup>:

'If the foundations be destroyed,  
What can the righteous do?'

A copy of Forrest's *Authority of Christ*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.